DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 073 039 SO 005 636

AUTHOR	Nehnevajsa, Jiri
TITLE	University-Urban Interface Program. Pittsburgh Goals and Futures.
INSTITUTION	Pittsburgh Univ., Pa. University Urban Interface Program.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Div. of Higher Education Research.
BUREAU NO	BR-8-0725
PUB DATE	Feb 73
GRANT	OEG-2-9-480725-1027
NOTE	186p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$6.58
DESCRIPTORS	*City Problems; *Community Change; *Community Study; *Futures; *Prediction; Research Projects; School Community Relationship; Social Change; Urban Universities
IDENTIFIERS	Pittsburgh

ABSTRACT

Future community changes in Pittsburgh over the next five years are predicted in this study, the purpose of which is to determine the extent of community consensus regarding changes and the extent to which widely differing perspectives of community leaders might contribute to conflict. One hundred and six selected, prominent, community leaders responded to a questionnaire assessing the likelihood, desirability and relative importance of twenty eight potential community problems. In addition, the leaders were asked to select at least three of the issues in order to identify what needs to be done about them, what things should be avoided, whether such steps are likely in the next five year period, and which segments or organizations of the community might hold views similar to and at odds with their position, and what measures the community or university could take regarding each issue. Results included indicate that the city's leaders are intensely interested in the future of Pittsburgh, and are modestly optimistic; that many leaders do not expect much in the way of positive change, and that there is an overwhelming consensus with reference to the areas of desired change although the study concludes that a good number of responses fall outside the general agreement. Pittsburgh leaders are highly receptive to change and reveal data which can be put to practical use. (SJM)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

BHE

SCOPE OF INTEREST NOTICE
The ERIC Facility has assigned this document for processing to: SO

In our judgement, this document is also of interest to the clearinghouses noted to the right. Indexing should reflect their special points of view.
HE

ED 073039

PITTSBURGH GOALS AND FUTURES

UNIVERSITY-URBAN INTERFACE PROGRAM

CONTRACT NO. OEG-2-9-480725-1027
PROJECT NO. 80725

SUBMITTED TO THE
BUREAU OF RESEARCH U.S.O.E.

1787

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH
FEBRUARY, 1973

SO 005 636

ED 073039

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH.
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

PITTSBURGH GOALS AND FUTURES

By

Jiri Nehnevajsa
Professor of Sociology

This paper was prepared under the auspices of the University Urban Interface Program; Principal Investigator, Albert C. Van Dusen, Secretary of the University; Director, Robert C. Brictson. February, 1973.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

A SUMMARY i

I. OBJECTIVES 1

1. PITTSBURGH GOALS AND FUTURES 2
2. PITTSBURGH GOALS STUDY 7
3. METHOD 9
4. RECEPTIVITY TO CHANGE 14
5. AGREEMENTS AMONG GROUPS OF LEADERS 21
6. RELATIONS AMONG THE EVALUATIVE DIMENSIONS 27

II. MAJOR RESULTS 36

1. ASSESSMENTS OF PITTSBURGH FUTURES 37
2. "UTILITY" AND "WORTH" 46
3. PERSPECTIVES OF GROUPS OF LEADERS 50

III. ADVICE AND CONCERN 73

1. INTRODUCTION 74
2. METROPOLITAN GOVERNMENT 74
3. NEW BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY 80
4. PUBLIC SCHOOL REFORM 83
5. RAPID TRANSIT 86
6. POLLUTION CONTROL 89
7. CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM 92
8. THE WELFARE SYSTEM 94
9. NEW REVENUE SOURCES 100
10. HEALTH SERVICES 102
11. THE BLACK COMMUNITY 106
12. HOUSING 111
13. DRUGS 113
14. OTHER ISSUES 115

IV. SOME IMPLICATIONS 119

1. THE NEXT FIVE YEARS 120
2. SO WHAT? 123

APPENDIX

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am deeply grateful to a number of colleagues from whose advice the study has benefitted. They are, of course, in no way responsible for any errors of omission or commission in either the data presentation or in the interpretation of the results.

Albert C. Van Dusen, Secretary of the University, Principal Investigator, University-Urban Interface Program.

Steele Gow, Dean, School of General Studies.

Robert Brictson, Director, Research Programs, Office of the Secretary.

Martha Baum, Principal Research Assistant, Learning Research and Development Center.

Holbert Carroll, Professor, Department of Political Science.

Morton Coleman, Professor, School of Social Work.

Joseph Eaton, Professor, Graduate School of Public Health, and Social Work.

David Epperson, Dean, School of Social Work.

Herschel Griffin, Dean, Graduate School of Public Health.

Matthew Holden, Professor, Department of Political Science, University of Wisconsin.

Burkart Holzner, Chairman, Department of Sociology.

Edgar Hoover, Professor Emeritus.

Saul Katz, Professor, Graduate School of Public and International Affairs.

Caryl Kline, Director, Continuing Education for Women.

Leslie Salmon-Cox, Research Assistant, Division of Instructional Experimentation, now Learning Research and Development Center.

Phillip Sidel, Executive Director, Social Science Information Center.

Waldo Treuting, Professor, Graduate School of Public Health.

I owe a special debt of gratitude to Alan N. Coleman, who was most ably assisting me in the conduct of the research throughout its duration, and to Josephine Stagno of the Sociology Department for her help in the preparation of the final manuscript.

Jiri Nehnevajsa

January, 1973

A SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

In the Spring of 1971, 106 prominent Pittsburgh community leaders responding to a mailed questionnaire, expressed their views on twenty-eight civic changes which might occur in the community over the next five years, that is, up through 1975 approximately.

For each of the twenty-eight potential changes, they were asked to assess its likelihood, desirability and relative importance. Moreover, additional options could be specified by the leaders themselves in the event they felt the twenty-eight were unduly restrictive of community concern. Each leader was also asked to select three issues considered particularly central to the community's future. For each of the three, they were asked to indicate (a) what ought to be done; (b) what measures, if any, should be avoided; (c) what, in their opinion, would actually happen over the coming five-year period; (d) what organizations or groups might share their views regarding a preferred course of action; (e) what organizations or groups might recommend different, or opposing, courses of action; and (f) what measures the universities of the city could or should undertake regarding the issue. A final question called for an estimation of the basic trends characterizing Pittsburgh development for the five-year time span.

The leaders included representatives from (a) Government and the Law; (b) Business and Banking; (c) Organized Labor; (d) Education; (e) Health and Welfare; (f) Housing and Urban Development; (g) Black Community Programs; (h) Anti-Poverty Programs; (i) Religious

Social Service Programs; (j) Environmental Control Programs; (k) the Mass Media; and (l) Others.*

OBJECTIVES

The main purpose of the study was to determine the extent to which there exists community consensus regarding a variety of major changes in Pittsburgh and, of course, the extent to which widely differing perspectives of community leaders might contribute to conflict, or at least significant difficulties, on these issues.

In turn, the identification of the perspectives among the community's leaders _might_ serve to open up a systematic dialogue concerning the city's agenda and priorities for the immediate future. This has been the more pragmatic aspiration of the study without assuming that such a dialogue would not be taking place already, or that it would not take place without this (or a similar) study, or that it would not happen through other, non-research related, mechanisms.

The results, presented here in summary form, hopefully will provide some elementary feedback to the leaders themselves as to how other leaders of the community look at Pittsburgh's near future. Also they can, in capsule form, examine the extent to which their particular views are shared or at variance with the sentiments of these other leaders.

LIMITATIONS

The twenty-eight Pittsburgh futures are stated, quite deliberately, in rather general terms. Thus, for example, we are concerned with the "Rapid Transit System" issue without regard for the particular configuration, technical design problems, legal, political and social ramifications, or the costs of construction and maintenance once implemented. Should it prove fruitful, subsequent phases of this study can proceed with examining the pros and cons of concrete proposals by which desired changes can come about or unwanted changes prevented.

---

*Throughout, the term "all leaders" will refer to the whole aggregate of participants in the study, disregarding the different groups mentioned here. The term "groups of leaders" will, on the other hand, be used for results considered in terms of the participant's main group location in the community (that is, groups (a) through (l) above).

We certainly do not suggest that the selected leaders are the only individuals whose views might be of strategic importance for the future of Pittsburgh. Others could have been included. However, in this initial phase, the choices were deliberately limited and whatever else may be said about their selection, they are, by any measure, among the community's major decision makers.

We do not assume that the views of the leaders are representative of the organizations and groups they are associated with; nor do we assume that their opinions are at odds with these groups. Hence, we do not wish to imply that, for example, the Government leaders who chose to cooperate in this study somehow made official or semi-official statements regarding the Government's position on the issue at hand. And so on.

Finally, we do not assume that it is the community's leadership alone whose views are decisive and that the wider public and its perspectives are unimportant, or even less important. Rather, at the outset, we wished to limit our inquiry in this manner and to subsequently expand the research-and-action dialogue to other segments of the community if this were to prove warranted.

MAJOR RESULTS*

1. There is ample evidence of an intense interest in, and a deep concern for, the future of Pittsburgh among the city's leaders. This indeed must be construed as signifying the kind of climate in which meaningful dialogue and meaningful action in the direction of desirable changes are not only possible on a relatively sustained basis, but welcome also.

2. There is a great deal of consensus among all the groups of leaders as to the desirability, likelihood and importance of various changes. Thus there exists basic agreement on broad purposes and the leaders are fundamentally not at odds with each other regarding community goals, nor are they in disagreement as to the nature of the wanted thrusts for the coming years.

3. Leaders in Government and Law appear to occupy a key position in the pattern of consensus in that their perspectives (desirability, likelihood and importance assessments) are generally closer to the views of all other groups of leaders than are the sentiments of any other single group. This seems rather fortunate because it suggests that Pittsburgh Government leaders are in a position to be both agents for change and catalysts for divergent views, without unacceptable risks of community conflict.

4. The data support the interpretation that the leaders are modestly optimistic regarding the future of Pittsburgh. In this pattern, Black Community Program leaders and leaders in Business and Banking, for somewhat different reasons, appear to be the least optimistic of all the groups.

---

*A total of 234 community leaders were asked to participate in the survey. The 110 who chose to respond represent about 47 percent of the total. This must be considered a rather high response rate since the instrument required about an hour of the individual's time and, by definition, these are among the busiest people in the community. The analysis is based on 106 responses with the remaining ones arriving after the basic tabulations had been completed.

5. Many leaders, in all groups, do not expect much in the way of positive change over the five year interval, and quite a few are concerned with the prospects of decline -- mainly occasioned by the continued population drift into suburbia (and elsewhere) coupled with the persistence of the complex systems of governance in Allegheny County. Such concern results also from problems associated with the steel industry and the absence of an expectation that new businesses and industries will be attracted into Pittsburgh and provide the needed diversification of the economy.

6. There is overwhelming consensus with reference to the first ten items, or issues, listed in the Summary Table. More than 90 percent of all the leaders agree on the desirability of change in the following areas:

1. Waste disposal and air and water pollution control devices.
2. Reorganization of public welfare agencies and programs.
3. Approaches regarding the use of drugs.
4. Development of a rapid transit system.
5. Distribution and accessibility of health care services.
6. The administration of criminal justice.
7. Development of new businesses and industries.
8. Pollution control laws.
9. The economic development of the Black community.
10. Low and middle income housing, including housing for the aged.

This means, we suggest, the following:

(a) These issues require no further discussions or justifications as to concern with major goals, only as to techniques or policy;

(b) Disagreements over means toward their attainment are likely to be fairly low-keyed;

(c) The room for the formulation and adoption of policies for these issues is quite considerable without the danger of generating community conflict provided the measures can be shown feasible (in terms of human and physical resources, including fiscal ones) and promising to bring about the postulated improvements.

7. The next eleven items listed in the Summary Table (ranked 11 through 20.5) are seen as areas of desired change by more than two-thirds of the leaders -- though fewer than 90 percent:

1. The regulation of automobile traffic.
2. Payment for health care services.
3. Public school programs and curricula.
4. Revenue sources for the city government.
5. Metropolitan government for the county.
6. The conditions of labor union pacts and agreements.
7. Programs of racial integration in the city.
8. The tax climate as it pertains to business and economic development.
9. Private organizations and welfare programs.
10. Political power development in the Black community.
11. Television, radio and newspaper coverage of Pittsburgh events.

Despite the prevailing consensus, the patterning of the responses which fall outside the general agreement (respondents who view particular issues as less than desirable rather than, as more than two-thirds do, desirable) is indicative of potential cleavages. The major ones to highlight are the following:

(a) Anti-poverty leaders are split among themselves as to the desirability of Metropolitan Government, changes in the tax climate, the need for changes in union pacts and agreements, the need for changes regarding private organizations in relation to welfare programs, and changes in the development of political power in the Black community.

(b) Black community leaders are divided as to the desirability of efforts at racial integration. They are also split over the tax climate issue.

(c) Government and Law leaders are divided, in particular, over the need for changes in public school programs and curricula and over the tax climate issue. Metropolitan government is also questioned by a few of them.

This would suggest the need for a careful, balanced dialogue on issues such as these since insofar as there is reluctance, or even opposition, its patterning tends to enhance what otherwise would be only a minor cleavage (if the non-dominant responses were about evenly scattered among the groups of leaders).

Overall, as a precondition for policy deliberations and planning, it would seem essential to discover the reasons for which some of the leaders express reluctance and opposition to changes which by far most of the others consider desirable (and important). This is particularly so with regard to those issues on which we have termed a "patterning" of dissensus exists.

8. An analysis of the reasons for reluctance -- and the resulting division of opinion -- is particularly needed in conjunction with these issues (ranked 22-24 in the Summary Table):

1. East Liberty-type development programs.
2. The impact of the Interstate Highway System.
3. Reorganization of the Board of Education.

A majority of the leaders finds change in these areas desirable but the level of agreement fails to reach the two-thirds margin. Without a clarification of the objectives and the rationale underlying them, as well as an assessment of the probable effects of moving in these directions, the formulation of actual proposals -- not to speak of their adoption -- would seem premature at this time. A fair magnitude of intracommunity conflict would have to be anticipated as the cost associated with such changes.

9. With regard to the remaining four issues, each was found to be acceptable by fewer than 50 percent of the leaders:

1. Changes in long term investment patterns in the community.
2. Changes in the direction of labor union organizing.
3. Development of political power among public welfare recipients.
4. Introduction of a "voucher" program for selecting among public and private schools.

These are alternatives not to be pursued at this time.

10. All in all, the data point to a very high receptivity to change among these Pittsburgh leaders. This means that there is

very little, if any, "inertia" built into the community's situation and the business at hand is primarily that of identifying viable ways of getting things done, rather than having to convince major portions of the community about the need for significant changes.

SUMMARY TABLE

DESIRABILITY, IMPORTANCE AND LIKELIHOOD OF TWENTY-EIGHT PITTSBURGH FUTURES: ALL LEADERS

Issue: as worded in questionnaire	Desirability		Importance		Likelihood		Per cent Acceptance
	Average	Rank	Average	Rank	Average	Rank	
Innovations in waste disposal and air and water pollution control devices	+1.62	1	8.39	1	7.81	2	96.2
Reorganization of public welfare agencies and programs	+1.60	2	8.27	4	6.92	3	96.2
Introduction of new approaches regarding the use of drugs	+1.58	3	8.38	2	6.61	8	96.2
Development of a Rapid Transit System for Pittsburgh and surrounding communities	+1.54	4	8.28	3	6.00	11	93.4
Innovations in the distribution and accessibility of health care services	+1.51	5	8.24	5	6.70	7	98.1
Major changes in the administration of criminal justice	+1.47	6	8.05	9	5.84	13	97.2
The growth of new businesses and industries in the community	+1.45	7	8.09	6	4.67	22	93.4
Development of new laws governing air and water pollution control	+1.40	8	8.08	7	7.78	2	93.4
Innovations in the economic development of the Black Community	+1.38	9	7.88	10	6.01	9.5	95.3
New developments in low and middle income housing, including housing for the aged	+1.35	10	8.07	8	6.89	4	96.2
Major changes in the regulation of automobile traffic	+1.29	11	7.29	15	4.99	19	89.6

SUMMARY TABLE -- Continued

Issue: as worded in questionnaire	Desirability		Importance		Likelihood		Per cent Acceptance
	Average	Rank	Average	Rank	Average	Rank	
New developments regarding the payment for health care services	+1.28	12	7.66	13	6.88	5	87.7
Major changes in public school programs and curricula	+1.27	13	7.77	11	6.01	9.5	86.8
Development of new sources of revenue for the city government	+1.21	14	7.71	12	5.89	12	85.8
Metropolitan Government for Allegheny County	+1.19	15	7.14	16	2.54	28	82.1
Development of new programs for racial integration in the city	+1.07	16	7.51	14	5.46	15	83.0
Innovations in the conditions of union pacts and agreements	+1.02	17	6.94	19	4.43	24	74.5
Major changes in the tax climate as it pertains to business and economic development	+1.01	18	7.09	17	5.36	16	76.4
Innovations by private organizations regarding welfare programs	+1.00	19	6.71	20	5.25	18	73.6
Major changes in the development of political power in the Black community	+0.95	20.5	6.99	18	5.60	14	73.6
Innovations in television, radio and newspaper coverage of Pittsburgh events	+0.95	20.5	5.52	27	4.48	23	76.4
Reorganization of the Pittsburgh Board of Education	+0.75	22	5.88	24	4.40	25	60.4
Construction of new urban development projects similar to East Liberty	+0.60	23	6.57	21	5.37	17	61.3

SUMMARY TABLE -- Continued

Issue: as worded in questionnaire	Desirability		Importance		Likelihood		Per cent
	Average	Rank	Average	Rank	Average	Rank	Acceptance
Changes in the direction of community development resulting from the completion of the Interstate Highway System in and around Pittsburgh	+0.53	24	6.18	23	6.79	6	56.6
Alteration in the patterns of long-term investment in the community	+0.48	25	6.26	22	4.33	26	46.2
Major changes in the direction of labor union organizing in the metropolitan area	+0.34	26	5.59	25	4.97	20	44.3
Development of political power among public welfare recipients	-0.04	27	5.55	26	4.93	21	34.0
Introduction of a "voucher" program to allow parents and children to select among private and public schools	-0.21	28	4.32	28	2.57	27	26.4

Explanations:

1. Table ordered in terms of desirability from most wanted to (relatively) least wanted change.
2. Desirability scale goes from (-2.00) to (+2.00).
3. Importance scale goes from (0) to (10).
4. Likelihood scale goes from (0) to (10).
5. Per cent acceptability gives the percentages of all community leaders who considered a particular item "desirable" or "very desirable."
6. When the same index value results (e.g., on desirability, likelihood or importance), the rank assigned is, as is conventional, the average rank for such tied values. For instance, rank 9.5 appears twice, and represents ranks 9 and 10 for which the items in question are tied (in this example, on "likelihood").

SOME CONCLUSIONS

The reader who, for want of time or patience or both, may not wish to go through the document from beginning to end might very well start by considering the very last section, "SO WHAT?", first of all.

Here, some major conclusions on the basis of the research are drawn. And even some recommendations are, not necessarily that they be carried out "or else," but that they be taken into account and *perhaps* implemented in this, or appropriately modified, form. The research, as presented here, provides direct feedback not only to the leaders who were kind enough to respond to the questionnaire but to other readers as well.

It is suggested that, perhaps, a useful orientation to the study (useful because of its constructive potential) is one which leads to self-reflective response. "Assuming that the community leaders in this study did, in fact say what the study purports they did, to what extent does my (reader's) perspective on these issues vary from that of the leaders as a whole, or from various subgroups of these leaders? What assumptions am I making, I, the reader, that would lead me to different estimates of what might be desirable or unwanted, important or unimportant, likely or not? What information might I need -- and what kind of information would it take (if any at all) -- that might lead me to change *my* view on a particular issue?"

The main reason why I have labelled this an orientation with a "constructive potential" has to do with the simple observation that it is easier to change one's own opinion (since one is presumably in more control over it) than it is to change the opinion of (sometimes many) others.

Three key problems were identified throughout the study. In some sense, solving these problems is a *precondition*, though probably not a necessary one in that without it nothing can be done, toward the creating of a community *climate* in which the very difficult job of collective living might be made somewhat easier. For one, the leaders mirror a rather negative attitude toward politics, politicians, political parties as they see them in their current forms. Hence, there is a need for serious reflection by politicians and by the major parties as to the kinds of reforms which involve tooling up and retooling toward enhanced responsiveness to the needs for leadership which complexities of metropolitan life seem to demand.

We have some opinions on what some such reforms might look like: but the research data do not reveal this, and we shall refrain from voicing strictly personal impressions. The study does, however, indicate that whatever changes or reforms might be contemplated, they have to do with abandoning "politics as usual" in the conventional sense.

The second major problem has to do with the good deal of pessimism manifest in the leader responses: about half of them feel that not much in the way of improvements will, in fact, happen -- and many think that Pittsburgh will "continue stagnating" or even "deteriorate further" (here, the terminology in quotation marks comes from the leaders themselves).

Hence, there is a need for community leaders, in and out of government, to ponder why it should be that people in positions of power and influence -- by definition therefore people could can help "make things happen" -- ought to be pessimistic instead of using their power and influence to affect the course of events. There is a need for reflecting why it is that one would then expect the citizenry at large to be more optimistic, more involved, more active if those in our midst who have more power and influence (and often, specialized know-how) are not.

The third major issue is connected with both former ones: many community leaders decry the absence of extra-governmental leadership as a stimulant, or catalyst or an additive (to governmental functioning). Hence, there would seem to be a need for some government-community coalition, not unlike the one which characterized the rather great achievements of the Pittsburgh Renaissance. And to bring that about, it would seem necessary for someone or a few someones to take the initiative.

Government, despite the less than benign image of politics and politicians, still remains at the hub of potential community consensus. We have documented this amply throughout.

We will certainly not be accused of timidity by having made the following suggestions:

> -The need for change or reform in existing political organizations (both Democratic and Republican) is obvious and it would seem desirable if it came from within the organizations rather than being eventually imposed upon them, as it will, from without (for instance, by ever-declining chances of "organization" candidates at the polls).
>
> -There is a need to depersonalize, both in actual pronouncements but especially in public communications (via media) about such pronouncements, statements of disagreement and disapproval and to make such matters issue-oriented rather than personality-related. Unless this is done we will continue feeding the cynicism regarding the "politicians" and "politics," and through this challenge the very fundamental structure of our society.
>
> -There is a need to establish procedures, ahead of time, by which each and every major decision is to be made and then abiding by such procedures and the resultant decisions. Otherwise we will continue to pit one individual against another, one group against another, after a decision has already been made, thereby delaying any possible, even badly needed, action.

And then there are a few specific things:

1. We suggested that numerous ideas regarding needed changes, and how to go about bringing them about, seem to remain untapped and that a kind of data bank of ideas (and suggestions and recommendations) might be a sensible step.
2. We suggested that ideas, sometimes even seemingly implausible ones (if only to determine the limits to which one can, or cannot, go) call for feasibility assessments, including the evaluation of probable (human and financial) costs and probable (human and financial) gains.

3. We suggested that experiences throughout the rest of the nation and abroad can be brought to bear on Pittsburgh problems, and that this might be accomplished by creating another data base which would make available information on how various policies, and approaches to policies, technologies and approaches to technologies, have worked elsewhere and with what difficulties.
4. We suggested that issues on which convictions are strong, and passions (often) run high, we may well consider using the (additional) advice of foreign experts who, so to say, have "no axe to grind." This, too, should be so in those areas in which we have already run out of good ideas.
5. We suggested the (risky) desirability of a continuing community dialogue on the various issues confronting us -- a dialogue, that is, in which one explores much longer than one "concludes," and in which one -- along with others -- reflects more than one espouses.
6. We suggested that many conflict situations might be defused, even preventively, by experimenting with multilateral rather than with bilaterial negotiations.
7. Finally, we suggested the need for an Urban Observatory type monitoring system, but mirroring the needs of Pittsburgh, as they are and as they evolve, so that we can ascertain where we are, where we are going, how to get there, with what "success" we seem to be getting where we might want to go, and the like.

These then are some of the things which might be tried: and pursued if they work, and abandoned if they don't.

I

MAJOR THEMES

1. PITTSBURGH GOALS AND FUTURES

We shall not delve into an analysis of problems associated with any systematic effort to come to grips with the notion of goals. Such an analysis begs an answer, at least at a level of concreteness at which it can be fruitfully approached. It asks the question: Do societies, or communities (or other human collectives) have goals in the sense that there are some identifiable targets toward which the actions of such human collectivities, communities, societies are oriented? It seems that to speak of goals of a society or of a community in such terms leads to abstractions of such an order that the answer to the question normally does not contribute to our knowledge of the ways in which collectivities grapple with actual problems of existence, make decisions, formulate policies--by public and private bodies--and carry them out.

For indeed, while we may assert that "betterment of life" or "enhancement of life quality" constitute worthy targets of human collectivities, and thus their goals, it becomes obvious that the abstraction ("quality of life") is unmanageable not only scientifically but, above all, at the level of plausible policy.

In fact, even if there exists society-wide, or community-wide, consensus on such things as that "improved health of inhabitants" (in turn defined more precisely as measures which prolong life, measures which prevent illness, measures which provide for treatment of illness which cannot be avoided, etc.) constitutes a component of "enhancement of life quality," the goal itself has variable saliency to different segments of the community when contrasted with other forms of life's quality betterments (e.g., "enhancing the educational level of all people" or "improving the quality of our (physical) environment").

Since men, as individuals and as members of groups, differ in their assessments of the priorities of the more concrete targets to be pursued and at the same time are unlikely to push or be moved in identical directions (that is, allow their energies to be mobilized in any one particular direction at a given time), the problem becomes one not of *discovering* what goals there are, but of ordering the various priorities. Due to the fact that time phasing and energy investment are always involved, any ordering leads to societal consequences different from those if other priorities were employed. From this also follows that *no* system of priorities and *no* concrete specifications of the elements of "life's quality" will satisfy all, or at least everyone equally or simultaneously. (There is one limiting circumstance when it would be possible to satisfy all: that is, if human and physical resources were of such unlimited magnitude as to allow the simultaneous and equally stressed quest for *all* high priority pursuits of *all* men. This is hardly a realistic situation now or in the foreseeable future.)

If we pursued this introductory analysis in detail--that is, to the levels of *actual* individual, family, or group *existence*--we would tend to discover that "society's goals" or "community goals" are all the "things" that people need and all the things people desire (to bring about or prevent), and that the problem is as difficult to handle at the abstract level of "life's quality" as it is at the level of concrete human pursuits.

Can we, in part at least, solve some of these difficulties in pursuit of the objective of contributing to *a* single community's (Pittsburgh's) dialogues regarding its goals? We think that this is possible, although the solution may leave something to be desired. For we shall have to redefine, and make the idea of *goals* more concrete, and only those readers who are willing to accept this redefinition may find the "solution" sufficiently compelling to warrant their attention.

Let us begin the requisite reanalysis of the problem, and then rest our case.

Barring a cosmic or man-made cataclysm which would destroy the community, one thing remains *certain*: *today will change into tomorrow*.

In Pittsburgh, as elsewhere, this will occur at midnight, and there will be a day after tomorrow, and one after that, piling up into "weeks," months," "years," "decades."

If this seems trivial, even as a starting point of our redefinition of community goals, the inverted statements, a whole host of them in infinite succession, are not trivial because of their direct consequence.

This class of inverted statements is of the following variety: "There will be Pittsburgh tomorrow"; "There will be Pittsburgh a week from now"; "There will be Pittsburgh one year from now" and so on ad potential infinitum--the hypothesis that "There will be Pittsburgh in the year 2,567" may interest us no more than that which states that there "will be" Pittsburgh in the year 2,267. In other words, the potential infinite class of statements "there will be . . ." gets truncated by our interest, or more specifically, by our time perspective in which it usually makes sense to ponder some things over several decades, others over a few years, and still others over a few months, weeks or even only days.

Let us now move to what we claimed to be a direct consequence of each statement of the "There will be . . ." category: it is certain that in the Pittsburgh of tomorrow (the existence of which we postulated also as a certainty), some "things" will be the same as they are today in that no measurable or observable differences will have been noted, and some things will be different from what they are today in that observable or measurable differences can be detected if one bothered to do so.

In other words, Pittsburgh as a community is a process, continuously nascent or emerging, and change, if minute (it may seem at any arrested point in time), is endemic.

Now, the same statements can be made about Pittsburgh the day after tomorrow--whether we compare it with tomorrow's community, or with today's "analytical point of departure." In other words, it is likely that some things will remain the same in Pittsburgh a week from now and other things will have changed. That this is so is certain (the proof, while not complex is lengthy and will not be provided at this time) even though we may not know "how many" things will have remained the same and "how many" will have changed. We also may not know *which* ones will have remained the same and which ones will have changed, although we know this a little bit better than "how many."

The next argument is of the following kind: when we begin with *today* (as a convenient point of departure, not because "today" is somehow more magical than any other day), it is *extremely likely* (although *not* certain) that the more time elapses, the *fewer will be the things which will remain the same as today, and the more there will be of those which will be different*. (Why this statement cannot be made at the level of "certainty" results from the fact that some changes are oscillatory in character, that is, some changes can be described as an essentially sinoid curve "oscillating" around some "normalcy," which is another term for an "equilibrium").

Now, if we are willing to postulate some changes over some definite duration, and if we are willing to postulate some non-changes, that is some stabilities, then measurements of acceptability or non-acceptability of such changes and non-changes can be roughly substituted for the measurement of the more metaphysical and elusive goals. This, then, is the central theme in our proposed solution: we shall consider the levels of acceptability of plausible changes--without necessarily knowing that such changes *will* occur, or without proposing that they should occur--as directions into which the community, and some segments of our community, are willing to move or are unwilling to move.

Hence, we are defining goals as acceptable changes (things to be brought about or put up with) and as unacceptable changes (things to be prevented, or today's structures to be maintained). The acceptable and unacceptable changes are characteristic of some future states of affairs; hence, we also are saying that acceptable (and unacceptable) changes--thus, goals by the redefinition--are acceptable and unacceptable futures. How these futures come about, or how they are to be prevented is not an issue we propose to raise at this time. Suffice it to say that some changes (resulting in futures different from today) are of the "secular" variety, that is, they are built into the dynamics of a functioning society and are a *consequence*, or joint product, of large numbers of truly, or seemingly, independent actions on the part of many numbers of truly, or seemingly, independent actions on the part of many people. They just "happen," which is another way of saying that we don't know about the processes by which some changes come about and thus we can neither control nor induce them.

Some changes, in turn, come about because of deliberate intervention of identifiable clusters of people within the community itself: local and county government, industrialists, educators, the mass media and the various mixtures of such "clusters." They are *induced* changes and as such, reflect our present limited state of knowledge of the *process of development*. This is the process by which we deliberately alter some "things" in society, in the physical environment, or in both, with an *intention* to produce a particular future state of affairs or with an *intention* to prevent some future state of affairs from coming about. Furthermore, both with regard to secular and induced changes, it would be well to consider exogenous as well as endogenous "forces" or "factors" involved. Thus, dealing with Pittsburgh and its environment, state government, and federal government may be viewed as exogenous factors since the "system" is defined as Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

Now, our capacity to induce changes obviously depends on firm or intuitive knowledge of cause-effect relations of some kind, in that some estimating is necessary to select from among the plausible measures those which are likely to produce the desired effects. These are perennial issues in planning and in policy formulation, and they cannot be dealt with in this discussion--not because they are unimportant or less important, but because they are *so important* that much more needs to be known before the questions could be entertained, at least in anything but the most speculative manner.

However, this effort does aim at providing *some* inputs into the policy formulation process, and we think that these types of inputs are strategic in character chiefly because they normally fail to be utilized (and even available) in the planning process itself. Let us now turn to the Pittsburgh Goals study itself, with the understanding that "goals" are defined here as "acceptable" *or* "unacceptable" futures, and that we are not, at the moment, in a position to cleanly separate those future changes which can be induced, and how they can be best induced from those which can be induced, and how they can be best induced from those which represent a societal drift of sorts.

2. PITTSBURGH GOALS STUDY

To shed some light on the directions of change (goals) which may find considerable resonance in Pittsburgh, and to understand some of the ones which may be less acceptable, we undertook a *preliminary* study during the Spring of 1971.

The study is preliminary in that we hope it to be only one in a series of inquiries which will allow us to probe the problems in ever increasing depth and precision. In the light of prior results, future studies can focus on the salicut and postpone the less salient issues.

We have already postulated that a society or community can hardly be construed as having goals in the sense that one could expect to mobilize all inhabitants, or even most of them, to push in particular directions so that the secular type of changes would result, or the developmental type of changes would be induced.

This implies level of consensus can hardly be expected at all, thus it makes no sense sociologically to postulate it, even as an "ideal type." Therefore, we must expect pushes and pulls from different directions within a community with the realized futures (that which actually happens being some blending of the forces operating as well as those failing to operate on the situation. The "failures" to act alter the relative distribution of all those forces which are operative.

All of the various "forces" are not acting in identical directions under most normal circumstances, nor do they have the same degree of effect upon the processes by which reality unfolds (e.g., by which today changes into the particular tomorrow it will become).

There are crucial differences in the relative power or efficacy of different individuals, organizations, population segments, and the like. In turn, this relative power derives from structural conditions, such as those having to do with the location of an individual in a position of authority (legitimized power) which, by definition, makes him more powerful than those subject to the authority (or subject to sanctions if they fail to comply). Relative power also deals with control over resources, human and physical as well as fiscal. This is partially an aspect of authority relations but not only that, hence the necessary distinction.

Furthermore, the variable saliency of changes and their acceptability derive in part from the differences in authority, and access to, and control over, resources.

In other words, the world of "goals" as future states of affairs becomes articulated in terms of different priorities and different acceptabilities by people in different locations throughout society.

In still more concrete terms: issues which may be of particular importance to, let us say, physicians are most likely different (or, at least we may expect them to be different) from those which are given highest priority by, for example, industrial workers. The goals perspectives of industrialists, in their priorities and even in their directionalities, may be different from the parallel perspectives of the community's religious leaders.

The point would be trivial if it was better understood, or at least it was not so frequently ignored in the actual process of thinking through the things which a community must do, which need doing, and which ought to be undertaken. For somehow "community goals" become the common denominators of divergent, and sometimes conflicting, forces or else their attainment is temporarily "staggered" so that some things begin to get done now and others a bit later, but with an understanding that, step-by-step, the divergent needs and desires will be met. This, of course, is an impossible task if these needs or desires are at odds with each other in some respects. Finally, a great deal of persuasion--both educational and propaganda--may be required to reorder the priorities of all or some groups to first increase consensus and then to act. This strategy often seems appropriate under "normalcy" conditions (in the absence of crises or threats of crises), but it is not workable in crises environments.

In this study, we sought to delineate some of the plausible change-states on which there may be consensus among important segments of the Pittsburgh community, or on which there may be varying degrees of disagreement.

The chief purpose of the inquiry, at this stage, has been to plot the directions in which the community, and its various crucial segments, are oriented with respect to Pittsburgh's future: what are the things they feel need doing, and the things they feel need not doing, forestalling, or altogether avoiding.

3. METHOD

In this phase of the research, 234 prominent Pittsburgh leaders were selected. Since the numbers are small, and identification (with the resultant threat of violation of privacy) could be conceivable, the following list indicates only the main categories from which these prominent members of the community were chosen:

1. Government
2. Business and Banking
3. Organized Labor
4. Education
5. Health and Welfare
6. Housing and Urban Development
7. Black Community Programs
8. Anti-Poverty Programs
9. Religious Social Service Programs
10. Environmental Control
11. Mass Media
12. Others

These 234 leaders are not the only community leaders in Pittsburgh: but by almost any standard one would choose, they are definitely part of the community's top leadership. Questionnaires were mailed to each of these selected individuals. Their help was sought, as was our intention, to share with us their insights into the community's problems, but to do so in a partially standardized manner.

As all social researchers know all too well, and often bitterly, the response rates to mailed-in questionnaires are anything but staggering, and even follow-up letters and further questions often do not help a great deal. We simply had no idea whether the approach could work at all since the time of each individual consulted is a rather precious commodity (mailed-in questionnaires with community leaders generally lead to very poor results, poorer than with other "populations") and filling out our questionnaire was, in effect, a request for close to one hour of their time. The response rate of 41 per cent (106 community leaders) under these circumstances must be viewed as high (though not "very high"). The response rate itself indicates the deep concern which these leaders have for the future of Pittsburgh, and the interest which they have in the community's development.

Table 1 indicates the response rates by the "categories" from which the respondents had been chosen.

TABLE 1

RESPONSE RATE TO MAILED-IN QUESTIONNAIRE ON PITTSBURGH'S FUTURE

	Per Cent
Mass Media	77
Environmental Control	71
Health and Welfare	65
Religious Social Services	63
Business and Banking	57
Anti-Poverty Programs	48
Housing and Urban Development	47
Government (and Law)	33
Others	33
Education	29
Black Community Programs	25
Labor Leaders	17
Average for All	41

Twenty-eight issues were selected for the standardized portion of the questionnaire. These issues will be dealt with, in some detail, in the analysis of the results, and are also contained in the questionnaire itself, which is included in the Appendix.

The community leaders were asked to consider each statement (issue) over a five-year period--thus into the mid-1970's. Typical issue statements might be:

"Reorganization of the Pittsburgh Board of Education."

Or,

> "Innovations in the distribution and accessibility of health care services."

They were asked to state:

(a) how likely or unlikely it seemed that the statement would correspond to the circumstances by mid-1970's,

(b) how desirable or undesirable the change each statement implied was to the respondent, or from the respondent's vantage point, and

(c) how important he considered the issue to be.

Following the reaction to each of the twenty-eight statements along each of the three dimensions (of likelihood, desirability and importance), each leader was provided with an option to add further statements of changes and, in turn, rate these subjectively added statements along the same lines.

The second portion of the questionnaire was altogether unstructured in terms of response options. The leaders were asked to select three of the issues (or any others they thought were important) and respond to the following questions:

1. What do you feel should be done regarding this issue?
2. On the other hand, is there anything you feel should not be done?
3. In general, what do you think will actually happen with this issue over the next five years?
4. What organizations or groups do you feel share your views concerning what ought to be done?
5. What organizations or groups do you feel might suggest a different approach from yours?
6. Are there any measures that you feel the Universities of the city could or should undertake regarding this issue?

The final two questionnaire items were the following ones:

1. In addition to the specific issues that you have just commented on, how do you feel the Pittsburgh community will develop as a whole over the next five years? That is, what significant trends do you see emerging over this time period?
2. Do you have in mind any other organizations, groups or individuals that you feel should be contacted for their views on the issues and trends you have presented here?

Table 2 sums up the pertinent data regarding overall response patterns.

TABLE 2

SUMMARY OF RESPONSE PATTERNS

	Per Cent
Did Not Answer	
Likelihood of issues	5.1*
Desirability of issues	3.3*
Importance of issues	3.7*
Responded to Part II of the questionnaire (with qualitative statements responsive to the questions)	79.2
Included items additional to the 28 incorporated in the questionnaire	17.9

*These percentages represent an average non-response rate over the 28 issues raised.

The average non-response rates, in terms of likelihood, desirability and importance, of course, obscure some interesting variations. For instance, over 20 per cent of the respondents did not venture to estimate the likelihood that "patterns of long-term investment in the community" would be altered.

4. RECEPTIVITY TO CHANGE

It has been often postulated that members of the establishment of any society, particularly those who may be classified as "elites," tend to be oriented chiefly toward the maintenance of the status quo. This is presumed to be in their interest, and is seen as such because the existing societal arrangements (e.g., the nature of the actual existing establishment) have enabled these particular individuals to rise to positions of power, and changes in the established order might threaten their capacity to retain their positions as well as the benefits which accrue from them.

If taken on its face value, the doctrine postulates resistence to change on the part of the elite members of a society, and receptivity to, and desire for, change on the part of the less privileged members of a society, the non-elites.

In the case of the Pittsburgh community leaders, this kind of simple model of conflict of interests does not hold. All twenty-eight items on the questionnaire were phrased in terms of changes, or departures, from the existing order of things in the Spring of 1971. We can construct a simple index of "receptivity to change" by arguing that a respondent's assessment that a change is "desirable" or even "very desirable" constitutes a clue to acceptance of change, and that the overall proportion of such "desirable" responses measures receptivity to change at least over the domain of the issues circumscribed by the twenty-eight statements.

The percentage of "desirable" or "very desirable" responses over the 28 items will then constitute a crude, but for our purposes satisfactory index of receptivity to change: it will be 100 per cent if only such reactions are found, that is, if everyone evaluates every one of the 28 items as either "desirable" or "very desirable." The index will be zero if everyone gives any other response, including non-response to a particular item.

Table 3 provides a summary of the data. For the community leaders as a group, the index is 77.9 per cent and its range, for the subgroups from which the leaders were drawn, lies between 70.8 and 82.6 per cent.

TABLE 3

"RECEPTIVITY TO CHANGE" INDEX AMONG PITTSBURGH COMMUNITY LEADERS

	Index
All Community Leaders	77.9
Government	74.5
Business and Banking	72.8
Education	70.8
Health and Welfare	79.8
Housing and Urban Development	82.6
Black Community Programs	76.1
Anti-Poverty Programs	74.3
Religious Social Services	80.9
Environmental Control	82.1
Mass Media	71.5
Others	79.3

It may be argued that some of the leaders are in social roles the functional purpose of which it is to induce changes, or, at least, to adapt to changes: such as "housing and urban development" people, or those in Black community programs, or those in anti-poverty efforts. But the point is this: the index value is high in all subgroups and not only in those in which such high values would be interpreted as a role-related response.

If our interpretation is correct, those members of the Pittsburgh community who are in non-elite, or even underprivileged, conditions certainly do not have to be at odds with the community's elites over the desirability of changes, most of which aim to the betterment of the life quality in the community as a whole. Now, what the measure does not show, nor do the other results in this phase of the study, has to do with the policies and steps which would have to be taken to accomplish the various postulated changes. In other words, while receptivity to change is high among the leaders, we do not know what conflicts would result, or latently exist, over the appropriateness of measures to induce the acceptable changes. In still other terms: consensus on ends does not necessarily imply consensus on means toward these ends, but whatever the levels of disagreement which may exist, in reality or in potential, their severity is much lesser than had disagreements been found with regard to the ends themselves.

Of course, there are differences in acceptability of the various changes. In Table 4, we have divided the 28 statements of the issues into four categories:

--those on which there is overwhelming consensus (90 per cent or more of the respondents view such changes desirable)

--those on which there exists community consensus (67 per cent but less than 90 per cent accept them--67 per cent being used due to the fact that 2/3 majorities under even the most vexing parliamentary rules establish "consensus")

--those on which there exists majority agreement (50 per cent or more but less than 2/3), and finally,

--those which are acceptable to a minority only (less than 50 per cent acceptance).

It turns out that 10 of the issues fall in the overwhelming consensus category, 11 in the consensus category, 3 in the majority agreement grouping, and 4 in the minority viewpoint.

TABLE 4

PITTSBURGH CHANGES: BY LEVEL OF ACCEPTANCE OF ITEMS

I. Overwhelming Consensus (90 per cent or more)

1. Innovations in the distribution and accessibility of health care services (104 leaders out of the total of 106)
2. Major changes in the administration of criminal justice (103)
3. Reorganization of public welfare agencies and programs (102)
4. Innovations in waste disposal and air and water pollution control devices (102)
5. New developments in low and middle income housing, including housing for the aged (102)
6. Introduction of new approaches regarding the use of drugs (102)
7. Innovations in the economic development of the Black community (101)
8. Development of new laws governing air and water pollution control (99)
9. Growth of new businesses and industries in one community (99)
10. Development of a rapid transit system for Pittsburgh and surrounding communities (99)

II. Community Consensus (67 per cent to 90 per cent)

1. Major changes in the regulation of automobile traffic (95)
2. New developments regarding the payment for health care services (93)
3. Development of new programs for racial integration of the city (92)
4. Development of new sources of revenue for the city government (91)

TABLE 4 -- Continued

---

5. Major changes in public school programs and curricula (88)
6. Metropolitan government for Allegheny County (87)
7. Major changes in the tax climate as it pertains to business and economic development (81)
8. Innovations in television, radio and newspaper coverage of Pittsburgh events (81)
9. Innovations in the conditions of labor union pacts and agreements (79)
10. Innovations by private organizations regarding welfare programs (78)
11. Major changes in the development of political power in the Black community (78)

III. Majority Agreement (50 per cent to 67 per cent)

1. Construction of new urban development projects similar to East Liberty (65)
2. Reorganization of the Pittsburgh Board of Education (64)
3. Major changes in the direction of community development resulting from the completion of the Interstate Highway System in and around Pittsburgh (60)

IV. Minority Acceptance (less than 50 per cent)

1. Alteration in the patterns of long-term investment in the community (49)
2. Major changes in the direction of labor union organizing in the metropolitan area (47)
3. Development of political power among welfare recipients (36)
4. Introduction of a "voucher" program to allow parents and children to select among private and public schools (28).

Let us assume that the views of the leaders who participated in this study are representative of Pittsburgh elites, and that they are not altogether at variance with the views of the community's inhabitants at large. (Whether this is a safe assumption or not is beyond speculation. We make this assumption, and the interpretations which follow are, of course, dependent upon the validity of the assumption. It is testable by sampling the Pittsburgh population and by including more members of the community's elites: thus, it is an assumption which, if need be, can be directly verified or falsified). Granting this assumption, a few bold (that is, somewhat unsafe but, to us, meaningful) interpretations seem in order.

1. Category I items (Overwhelming consensus on acceptability of change) do not require further justifications; in fact, they establish potential policy directions the worthwhileness of which can be simply taken for granted.

(a) Due to the exceptionally high consensus on these items (as desirable future states of affairs), disagreements over means toward these acceptable ends are likely to be low keyed, if any at all;

(b) Thus almost any measures (short of extremely radical ones, e.g., those which imply almost reversals of existing policies) are likely to be acceptable as steps toward these objectives; therefore,

(c) The room for the development and adoption of policies in this regard is quite considerable without the danger of generating community conflict as long as the measures can be shown to be feasible (in terms of human and physical resources, including funds), and promising in bringing about the postulated changes.

2. Category II items (Community consensus on acceptability upon further, if modest, justifications as to worthwhileness are likely to become Category I community objectives. Thus, some further justifications as to "why" things ought to be done and need doing would be preferred as the first step before actual specific measures to implement such changes are, themselves, promulgated.

(a) More cleavage on actual policies to bring about such changes can be expected, with the effect that decisions either would amount to imposing policies upon (many) people or else, would occur over longer periods of time in order to generate the kind of acceptable compromises which may be required;

(b) More conservative measures (e.g., those which depart less from the existing conditions) will prove more acceptable as initial measures than more drastic alterations (e.g., consensus on means will tend to be formed around alternatives that are substantially less "drastic" than would be the case with Category I item).

3. Category III items (Majority acceptance) first require further community dialogue as to their justifications, that is, the reasons for which such (generally stated) changes should be acceptable.

(a) At this time these are not action items but "persuasion" items, that is, they are issues on which the community needs to be further enlightened so that its view crystallizes one way (acceptance) or another (non-acceptance).

(b) Attempts at formulating policies in these directions are likely to lead to community conflicts, the human and financial cost of which would derive from adoption of such policies. They are divisive items, at this time.

4. Category IV items (Minority viewpoint) would call for no action at this time, but they do call for "being watched" (that is, monitored via research or other appropriate techniques) to see changes in acceptability of these items which might occur over the next year or two. But they are, in principle, the kinds of things one would not undertake at this time without the risk of antagonizing most segments of the community.

These interpretations might be inaccurate, but they are "testable" in the sense that modest steps could be made in the direction of some of the issues in each "category" specified, and the consequences of these attempts either would follow the propositions that have been formulated or would not follow them.

At this point the reader is cautioned that some of the conclusions reached thus far may have to be modified slightly, and redirected, when we also consider the likelihood which the leaders attach to the various specific changes, and the importance which they attribute to them.

5. AGREEMENTS AMONG GROUPS OF LEADERS

Other than the category entitled "other" (which includes leaders of non-Black ethnic groups and a few other leaders who chose to respond in a manner which made their group identification impossible in analysis), we are dealing with ten key segments of Pittsburgh's elites.

Now, crucial questions arise about the extent to which these groups, as represented by the respondents in the study, are in agreement or disagreement with each other along the criterion-dimensions of the research: the likelihood associated with the various plausible changes, their desirability, and their importance.

Tables 5-7 sum up the results. Here, we provide the correlations of each group with each other group ("government" with "business and banking" and so on). These are correlations based on the rankings of the 28 items. Thus Table 5, for instance, involved ranking of series of 28 items for each prominent group, and relating these rankings to similar evaluations derived from all other groups.

If the rankings (from highest to lowest likelihood, in this case) were identical for any two groups, the correlation would be, of course, 1.00. If the rankings were precisely the opposite (what one group sees as most likely, the other would see as least likely, and so on for all the 28 items), the correlation measure would be (-1.00).

TABLE 5

RANK ORDER CORRELATIONS OF LIKELIHOOD

Business	Education	Health and Welfare	Housing	Black Programs	Anti-Poverty	Religion	Environmental Control	Media	Government	Average
Business	.668	.678	.602	.622	.623	.577	.669	.759	.695	.655
Education		.700	.711	.603	.686	.714	.749	.754	.641	.692
Health and Welfare			.709	.627	.788	.689	.713	.622	.729	.695
Housing				.599	.607	.780	.654	.687	.829	.686
Black Programs					.543	.466	.584	.517	.650	.579
Anti-Poverty Programs						.698	.675	.718	.726	.674
Religion							.590	.694	.812	.669
Environmental Control								.588	.711	.659
Media									.797	.682
Government										.732

TABLE 6

RANK ORDER CORRELATIONS ON DESIRABILITIES OF ISSUES

Business	Education	Health and Welfare	Housing	Black Programs	Anti-Poverty	Religion	Environmental Control	Media	Government	Average
Business	.674	.643	.609	.281	.651	.702	.314	.788	.720	.598
Education		.785	.639	.674	.840	.812	.663	.705	.771	.729
Health and Welfare			.768	.602	.700	.757	.579	.777	.832	.716
Housing				.365	.544	.642	.458	.687	.794	.612
Black Programs					.486	.703	.457	.447	.632	.516
Anti-Poverty Programs						.617	.720	.706	.722	.665
Religion							.654	.597	.714	.689
Environmental Control								.444	.463	.528
Media									.855	.667
Government										.722

TABLE 7

RANK ORDER CORRELATIONS IN TERMS OF IMPORTANCE OF ISSUES

Government	Business	Education	Health and Welfare	Housing	Black Programs	Anti-Poverty	Environmental Control	Religion	Media	Average
Government	.665	.809	.807	.768	.602	.599	.379	.753	.592	.663
Business		.685	.562	.694	.400	.457	.085	.518	.605	.519
Education			.877	.763	.577	.755	.482	.837	.612	.711
Health and Welfare				.753	.601	.674	.492	.832	.474	.674
Housing					.458	.637	.367	.598	.431	.608
Black Programs						.403	.334	.613	.686	.519
Anti-Poverty Programs							.553	.584	.275	.548
Environmental Control								.457	.250	.378
Religion									.457	.628
Media										.487

In all three tables (5-7), all correlations are positive. Agreements far predominate disagreements. No groups, from among those studied, are pitted against each other in terms of what they expect to happen (likelihood, Table 5), what they want to happen (desirability, Table 6), or what they consider important (Table 7).

The results further reveal the high level of consensus which seems to exist in Pittsburgh, the kind of consensus which establishes grounds for positive action, or for complacency borne out of a lack of a crisis climate. Whether policy action or complacency might tend to dominate the Pittsburgh scene is not made clear by the results, although we shall point to some of the specific problems as we go along.

Not only is there consensus, as the positive correlations indicate, there is a great deal of it, as indicated by the numerical high values of the respective coefficients. The lowest coefficient in terms of likelihood (.466) is between the leaders of Black Community programs and the leaders of religious social service efforts. The highest agreement (.829) on likelihood is between people in Government and those who are in one of the specialized Government services--Housing and Urban Development efforts.

In terms of desirability, the lowest coefficient (.281) links the leaders from business and banking and those leading the Black community programs. In turn, the highest agreement (.855) is between the leaders in the community's mass media and government.

Finally, in the importance ratings, the least agreement (.085--singularly low given the remainder of the data) is between business and banking leaders and those responsible for environmental control programs in the community. The highest agreement (.877) connects the leaders in education with those in Health and Welfare.

If we had data from all possible groupings of a community and if we intercorrelated the results for all pairs of groupings and along whatever salient dimensions (here, likelihood, desirability and importance), it would be reasonable to say that *the* community segment (or group) *in greatest agreement with all groups and segments forms the kind of hub around which community consensus can be* (*optimally*) *built*. In other words, this would be a group, say A, which is least "distant" from all other groups, B, C, D, . . . N. Based on this premise, we have formed a simple index of this "*centrality*" within the community by averaging the degree of agreement or disagreement (correlation) for each group of leaders.

The results are given in the last column of Tables 5, 6 and 7, respectively. If the premise is an acceptable one, the value of the index is limited *only* by the fact that not all relevant segments and groups within the community are included in the summary measure. The correlations, with very minor exceptions, are very high and all are positive. This creates a situation in which all of the groups studied are rather close to each other in terms of all three axes of ratings, likelihood, desirability and importance. However, some subtle differences are worth noting.

1. *Government* (including the law) turns out to be the "hub" of the community in terms of what future states of affairs are to be expected and not expected (likelihood). The average correlation of the government leaders with all (page 22) others (treated group-wise) is .732. Leaders in Health and Welfare services turn out to be second in this sense of a "centrality" measure (.695), and educators (.692), third.

2. Leaders in education are *first*, by this measure, in terms of the desirability of the various transformations (.729), *Government* is second (.722), and Health and Welfare leaders are third (.716).

3. With regard to importance attached to the various issues, educators are first (.711), Health and Welfare leaders second (.711) and *Government* (.633) third.

Let us now emphasize that being at the "hub" in terms of potential community consensus and actions stemming from consensus is not to be seen as identical with being "right" either in a moral or a technical sense. What this does mean is that whatever patterns of evaluations exist regarding the issues the community faces, certain groups emerge to be "closer" in their aggregate viewpoints to all other groups than are other groups or segments. On all three evaluative dimensions, three groups "occupy" the dominant three positions: Government, Educators, and Health and Welfare leaders. From the vantage point of Pittsburgh's actual future, it seems very proper to be impressed by the fact that Government is one of the groups in this central position.

Although the leaders of community education yielded the lowest index (but still a very high one) of "receptivity to change" (Table 3) it is absolutely vital to understand the meaning of their position at the "hub" of the centrality index: it would signify, if we are bold in our interpretation, that the desire for changes is widespread and intense but that the changes which will be most acceptable are of a graduated, rather than drastic, variety and that they are changes in particular domains of life and not simply changes. The "overwhelming consensus" items are of this nature.

Furthermore, and bolder still: since the "centrality" concept in each instance involves leaders from Health and Welfare programs, among the high priority items indicated in Table 4 those which involve measures concerning "health and welfare" would have to be construed as having the highest priorities.

6. RELATIONS AMONG THE EVALUATIVE DIMENSIONS

Now importance and likelihood estimates pertaining to the same set of issues may be related but certainly and intrinsically need not be related to each other.

Futures which are likely (or unlikely) may come about (or fail to come about) as a product of the secular drifts of society, that is, the dynamics of all interactions the nature of which is unknown. They may also come about as a result of inducing changes, but this, too, may produce consequences other than those intended.

Hence, it does not follow that what is assessed to be "important" to happen is also likely to happen. Similarly, there is no inherent relationship between desirability and importance. This is so because important things may be undesired, and because people can assess as relatively unimportant to the community as a whole those things they themselves desire.

Similarly, there is no need to postulate an automatic relationship between likelihood and desirability. Desirable futures may be unlikely and undesirable ones likely, which would yield, if anything, a negative relationship. Nor is it possible to cleanly interpret a positive relation, that is, when there is a tendency for desirable futures also to be seen as likely, and undesirable ones unlikely. The difficulty is obvious: such a positive relation may reflect wishful thinking, or it may reflect a realistic appraisal that by actions one "makes" the desirable things happen and prevents the undesirable ones from happening.

Thus the three evaluative dimensions of likelihood, desirability importance used in the study are _conceptually independent_ although they _need not be empirically independent at all_.

In this particular study, the evaluative variables _are_ interrelated, and the relations are positive, and on the whole are fairly and even "very" high. Table 8 gives the correlations of the relationships for each group of leaders. The correlations between what is desirable and what is important are uniformly high, and they are higher, for each group, than any of the other coefficients.

TABLE 8

RANK ORDER CORRELATIONS OF THE EVALUATIVE DIMENSIONS

	Importance & Likelihood	Importance & Desirability	Likelihood & Desirability
Government	.536	.930	.473
Business	.321	.899	.202
Education	.711	.908	.633
Health and Welfare	.620	.912	.481
Housing	.621	.787	.512
Black Community Programs	.364	.680	.181
Anti-Poverty Programs	.451	.737	.425
Religion	.743	.928	.818
Environment Control	.578	.859	.682
Media	.469	.683	.618

As for the relationship between likelihood and desirability, two of the coefficients are much lower than all the others: that for the leaders of Black Community programs (.181) and the measure for leaders in business and banking (.202). Although the agreement on likelihood between these two groups (shown in Table 5) is fairly high (.622), the agreement on desirabilities is not (Table 6, the correlation amounts to .281).

Thus both Black leaders and business and banking leaders are somewhat less than optimistic (low likelihood/desirability correlation), but the reasons (i.e., the items involved) are clearly quite different in that the nature of their higher priority orientations is different. That these two groups, Black community leaders and business leaders, view the Pittsburgh situation differently--in important ways--from the other groups and also from each other, is further underscored by the fact that the importance/likelihood correlations are also the lowest ones for these particular segments of the leaders (.321 for business leaders and .364 for Black programs leaders).

But these differences must not be allowed to obscure the fundamental observation of consensus on the whole and of rather optimistic perspectives regarding the future, on balance, for all the groups; none of the correlations are even close to being negative, something which would be an index of serious impending difficulties, especially if, for instance, likelihood and desirability coefficients were to be on the negative side of the index range.

It means simply that business leaders are not very optimistic that things they consider particularly important will happen, and that those things they view as desirable are very likely. The Black community leaders look at the situation in a similar light.

If we disregard the particular groups (such as Government, Education, Black Community Programs), and consider only the overall relations among the evaluative measures for the leaders irrespective of their groups, wefind (Table 9) that the rank correlations are higher than theaverage correlation over the separate groups of leaders.

TABLE 9

OVERALL AND AVERAGE RANK CORRELATIONS OF THE EVALUATIVE DIMENSIONS

	Desirability/ Importance	Desirability/ Likelihood	Likelihood/ Importance
Average	.832	.502	.541
Overall	.965	.652	.710

Remark: The average correlation is obtained on the basis of the coefficients reported in Table 8.

The overall correlation is obtained by ranking the 28 futures-items for the whole group of (106) leaders regardless of the subgroups and assessing the relationship between the paired sets of ranks.

In the aggregate then, the relations between the pairs of measures tend to exceed an average relationship when the groups of leaders are treated separately. This means that there is a kind of balancing effect in which some of the differences between groups run counter to one another so that the overall community response amounts to a systemic, rather than an additive, result.

Importance and desirability correlate higher (.965) for all leaders than they do for any subgroup; desirability and likelihood yield a higher correlation (.652) for all leaders than they do for all the groups separately, except for religious leaders and those involved in environment control activities. Finally, likelihood and importance correlate higher (.710) than they do for the separate groups, with the exception of religious leaders and educators.

Let us pursue this exercise one step further. In Table 10 the desirability correlations are given. The first column is the average correlations taken from last column of Table 6, showing how each group of leaders, on the average, agrees with the other groups. The second column is calculated to provide the correlation between each group of leaders and the leaders taken as a whole. Thus, a correlation of (.801) for Business means that there is this level of relationship between the rank-ordering as to desirability between the Business leaders included in the study and all of the leaders.

Comparing the "correlation with all" coefficients with those from Table 6, wefind that the agreement on desirability over the set of 28 issues is substantially higher for each group relative to all leaders than for each group's average (of correlations for all pairs of groups). Furthermore, the specific pairwise coefficients of Table 6 are all lower than the correlation between the desirability rankings for these groups and all leaders.

TABLE 10

DESIRABILITY CORRELATIONS: GROUP AVERAGES AND THE CORRELATION BETWEEN EACH GROUP AND ALL LEADERS

	Average Correlation*	Correlation With All
Government	.722	.920
Business	.598	.801
Education	.729	.914
Health and Welfare	.716	.862
Housing	.612	.729
Black Programs	.516	.649
Anti-Poverty	.665	.870
Religion	.689	.847
Environment Control	.528	.772
Media	.667	.849

*For the "average" correlation, refer to last column of Table 6.

The overall correlation (.729) for Housing and Urban Development leaders is lower than the correlation between the HUD respondents and the Government leaders (.794, as per Table 6) and also, between the HUD leaders and the Health and Welfare respondents (.768 as per Table 6). The overall correlation (.649) for Black Community Programs leaders is lower only than between Black Program leaders and religious leaders (.703 as per Table 6). And finally, the overall correlation of the Media leaders (.849) is exceeded only by the desirability correlation between these Media leaders and the Governmental leaders (.855 as per Table 6).

The basic pattern, and its implications, is that of Table 9, leading us to a potentially promising interpretation. Thus the "exercise" referred to has been anything but idle.

1. As yet, no statement can be made about specific issues and the patterning of agreements and disagreements, overall and groupwise.

2. But when it comes to considering community-plans which, of necessity, involve a variety of possible problems and a variety of possible thrusts, we must conclude as follows: when clusters of issues are handled by any combinations of interested and perhaps involved groups short of community-wide group participation, the chances of agreement are lower than when the same issues are tackled in a genuinely pluralistic context.

3. Black Community leaders, however, may find agreements more to their liking when "allied" with religious leaders of the community than when acting in an overall community context.

4. Housing and Urban Development leaders similarly find themselves in a somewhat easier alliance with Government and with Health and Welfare leadership than when they have to deal with community groups *in toto* (that is, those represented in this study).

5. Media leaders find an easier rapprochement in this regard to Government than they do in a broader community context.

6. Government, by this measure, is in the fortunate position (at this time) to be more in agreement with the divergent interests of the community *than any other group* involved in this study.

7. All the overall coefficients are high, however, so that the pluralistic type of approach to planning for the community's future, and, we presume, to implementing plans is likely to produce agreements most acceptable to all community segments.

8. Such agreements as might be acceptable to all community segments may not prove to offer the "best" solutions in a technical sense but they are "best" in the sense of *minimization of conflict over goals*, while allowing ample room for the resolution of conflicts

over the best methods by which agreed-upon goals might be attained. This, in itself, is no news, and will not surprise anyone familiar with the workings of multiple pressures upon one and the same situation or set of situations.

But we shall be bold and draw a crucial, practical conclusion. We will do this even if the numerical results are simply an arithmetic artifact (due to theway in which coefficients are calculated and are naturally dependent upon one another over a system of data). Whatever the case may be, this is not the first, nor the last occasion when a possibly trivial mathematical solution leads to ideas which are not trivial.

The sense of the data, at this overall level of patterns, is as follows:

> IT IS POSSIBLE TO "DIFFUSE" CONFLICTS (WHICH USUALLY PIT TWO AND OCCASIONALLY MORE GROUPS AGAINST EACH OTHER) BY PARTICIPATION OF GROUP REPRESENTATIVES NOT DIRECTLY INVOLVED IN THE CONFLICT, AND THE DIFFUSING WILL BE THE EASIER (ALTHOUGH NOT NECESSARILY FASTER) THE GREATER THE REPRESENTATION OF MORE COMMUNITY INTERESTS AND PRESSURES.

By "diffusing conflicts," in turn, we do not mean ignoring them, or maintaining the given state of affairs. Rather, we suggest THAT SOLUTIONS TO PARTICULAR CONFLICTS WILL BE FOUND EASIER IN A NON-PARTICULAR, COMMUNITY-WIDE CONTEXT THAN IN NEGOTIATIONS BETWEEN THE DIRECTLY INVOLVED PARTIES ALONE. The notion is, we think, a good deal better than the idea of ARBITRATION which assumes a third "disinterested" party to come up with an alternative satisfactory to, and binding upon groups at odds with each other.

The idea is TO HANDLE COMMUNITY CONFLICTS BY THE INCLUSION OF A VARIETY OF COMMUNITY GROUPS IN THE PROCESS OF NEGOTIATION, NOT BECAUSE THEY WILL BE "MORE OBJECTIVE" OR THAT THEIR IDEAS WOULD BE "MORE BINDING" OR BECAUSE THEY ARE INVOLVED IN THE CONSEQUENCES OF THE OUTCOME--BUT BECAUSE IT SEEMS THAT VIABLE SOLUTIONS CAN BE MORE EASILY UNCOVERED! In this, of course, we are going way beyond the confines of the data themselves. But then, we do not collect data for the sake of the data alone; it is the uses, imaginative or otherwise, to which we can put data and those theories on which they are based, or the theories which they suggest, that are of importance.

II

MAJOR RESULTS

1. ASSESSMENTS OF PITTSBURGH FUTURES

In the previous section of the report, we have considered only the general patterns of response--and some of the implications which these overall expressions of opinion appear to have.

There was, however, one exception to this: to show variability over the twenty-eight change items with respect to the "receptivity of change" index (Table 3), a simple percentage measure of "acceptability" was developed (Table 4 and text) to show which of the futures explicitly involved in the study met with varying levels of consensus in the group of leaders questioned.

In this section of the paper, we must deal with the specific futures, and evaluate some of the ramifications of the findings both in theoretical and more practical terms. To set the tone for the subsequent discussions, Table 11 provides five indixes for each of the items for the total group of leaders.

The desirability and likelihood indices (Table 11) represent a simple transformation of the verbal replies into number scales. "Very desirable" answers were assigned a value of (+2), "desirable" ones (+1), "undesirable" (-1), and "very undesirable" (-2) with (0) weight reserved to the mid-point of the scale: something that seems neither desirable or undesirable, or else, some item in which positive and negative factors seem to balance each other out so that the resultant answer, from the vantage point of the respondent, is a neutral one. The index thus ranges from (-2) to (+2) and would attain these extreme values only if there were complete consensus that an item is either "very undesirable" (-2 average) or "very desirable" (+2 average).

The likelihood index resulted by using (10) as a weight for something that is "very likely," a weight of (7) for "likely" futures,

TABLE 11

PERSPECTIVES ON VARIOUS PITTSBURGH CHANGES
(ORDERED HERE IN TERMS OF DESIRABILITY)

	Desirability (1)		Likelihood (2)		Importance (3)		Utility (1)(2)*		Worth (1)(2)(3)**		Item Number
Pollution control devices	+1.62	1	7.81	1	8.39	1	63.2	1	53.1	1	18
Public welfare and programs	+1.60	2	6.92	3	8.27	4	55.3	2	45.8	2	15
Drug use approaches	+1.58	3	6.61	8	8.38	2	52.2	4	43.8	4	27
Rapid Transit	+1.54	4	6.00	11	8.28	3	46.2	7	38.2	6	26
Health delivery systems	+1.51	5	6.70	7	8.24	5	50.1	5	41.7	5	13
Criminal justice reforms	+1.47	6	5.84	13	8.05	9	42.9	9	34.6	8	2
New business and industry	+1.45	7	4.67	22	8.09	6	33.8	13	27.4	13	6
Anti-pollution laws	+1.40	8	7.78	2	8.08	7	54.4	3	48.8	3	19
Economic development of Black community	+1.38	9	6.01	9.5	7.88	10	41.4	10	32.7	10	11
Payment for health services	+1.28	10	6.88	5	7.66	13	44.0	8	38.7	9	14
Low and middle income housing	+1.35	11	6.89	4	8.07	8	46.5	6	37.6	7	22

TABLE 11 -- Continued

	Desirability (1)		Likelihood (2)		Importance (3)		Utility (1)(2)*		Worth (1)(2)(3)**		Item Number
Automobile traffic regulation	+1.29	12	4.99	19	7.29	15	32.2	14	18.2	17	25
Public school programs	+1.27	13	6.01	9.5	7.77	11	38.2	11	29.6	11	7
New revenue sources	+1.21	14	5.89	12	7.71	12	35.6	12	27.4	12	3
Metro Government	+1.19	15	2.54	28	7.14	16	15.1	24	11.3	21	1
Racial integration	+1.07	16	5.46	15	7.51	14	29.2	15	21.9	14	10
Union pacts conditions	+1.02	17	4.43	24	6.94	19	22.1	19	15.2	19	20
Business tax climate	+1.01	18	5.36	16	7.09	17	27.0	16	19.2	15	4
Private welfare changes	+1.00	19	5.25	18	6.71	20	26.2	18	17.6	18	16
Black political power	+0.95	20.5	5.60	14	6.99	18	26.6	17	18.6	16	12
Media coverage	+0.95	20.5	4.48	23	5.52	27	21.3	20	11.8	20	28
Board of Education	+0.73	22	4.40	25	5.88	24	16.0	22.5	9.4	24	9
East Liberty type projects	+0.60	23	5.35	17	6.57	21	16.0	22.5	10.6	23	23
Hiway system	+0.53	24	6.79	6	6.18	23	18.0	21	11.2	22	24
Long-term investment patterns	+0.48	25	4.33	26	6.26	22	10.4	25	6.5	25	5
Changes in union direction	+0.34	26	4.97	20	5.59	25	8.4	26	4.7	26	21

TABLE 11 -- Continued

	Desirability (1)		Likelihood (2)		Importance (3)		Utility (1)(2)*		Worth (1)(2)(3)**		Item Number
Political power of welfare recipients	-0.04	27	4.93	21	5.55	26	-0.05	27	-0.05	27	17
"Voucher" system	-0.21	28	2.57	27	4.32	28	-0.3	28	-1.2	28	8

Desirability index range: (-2) to (+2)
Likelihood index range: (0) to (10)
Importance index range: (0) to (10)
Utility index range: (-100) to (+100) - *linear transformation from (-20) to (+20)
Worth index range: (-100) to (+100) - **linear transformation from (-200) to (+200)

Item number refers to the identification of each item on the questionnaire and is provided here for ease of reference since only abbreviated statements have been used in the table to describe each issue.

(3) for "unlikely" ones, and (0) for "very unlikely" alternatives. It ranges, therefore, from (0) to (10), and values over (5) represent futures characterized by being "likely," whereas values below (5) indicate degrees of "unlikelihood." In turn, a value of (5) or just around (5) in this measure stands for things with which 50-50 odds are approximately associated.

The questionnaire provided for numerical estimates, from (0) to (10), of "importance" so that the corresponding index draws directly upon the answers as given by the leaders, and did not call for attaching additional (and, naturally, arbitrary) weights to produce the respective column of Table 11. Now, indeed, the rank correlations of Table 9 (entitled "Overall Correlations") were calculated with respect to the ranks as they are given in Table 11, following the index values for each of the three major dimensions, those of desirability, likelihood, and importance.

From Table 9 we already know that what the leaders thought was desirable they also saw as important, what they considered desirable also was likely, though less so, and that likelihood and importance, too, were highly interrelated. These were not artificial or arithmetically or theoretically necessary results. If desirable futures were unlikely, that is, if the leaders thought that the things which ought to happen will not happen, and those which are less wanted, or even unwanted, were likely, the coefficient naturally would reflect this.

It is similarly theoretically sound to say that desirability and importance need not correlate: many things might be desirable (to varying degrees), but they need not be the very important ones. That the correlation is very high is an empirical finding and it does not, in itself, bring into question the theoretical independence of the two measures, desirability and importance.

Let us postpone the discussion of the two new indices "utility" and "worth" for a subsequent section of the report, and deal first with the three key variables, the first three items of Table 11. We can now refine the previous results by discovering what it is that the leaders really agree upon, and agree upon to different degrees.

Since we know that the pairwise rank correlation over the set of futures are high, it may be more instructive to look in some detail at those items in which the relative orderings on any two of the dimensions (desirability, likelihood, importance) do not coincide, in other words, those items which contribute greatly toward reducing the coefficient from what would be represented by a perfect agreement coefficient of +1. These are items which are "much more" (in the above terms) desirable than they are likely; those which are "much more" likely than they are desirable; and similar statements about desirability and importance; and about likelihood and importance. The notion of being "much more" one thing than another, however, is to be interpreted in strictly relative terms. That is, it has to do with the relative position of the item among the set of twenty-eight under study. It has nothing whatsoever to do with any absolute judgment of the merits of an item "standing alone" as it were, or even with judgments which might result if the set were of a different configuration (if other items were used, or if there were additional items, or fewer items). These cautionary remarks seem altogether necessary because all interpretations of relationships are grounded in the roster of these particular futures and, we repeat, are relative to that roster of items.

1. Desirable But Less Likely Futures

The greatest relative difference (in terms of rank ordering of the items) has to do with the prospects of bringing into Pittsburgh new business and industry. This alternative ranks 7th in desirability, but 22nd in likelihood. Indeed, the likelihood index (4.67) falls slightly below the 50-50 odds so that this future is, in fact, considered somewhat unlikely although it is very desirable, indeed. Its importance for Pittsburgh's future also is believed to be high (6th on importance).

Hence, the notion of "somehow" bringing new business and new industry into Pittsburgh is very desirable, very important, but it is considered to be improbable over the five year period involved.

The development of a Metropolitan Government, too, is an alternative with similar characteristics. It is somewhere in the middle of the total set of options as to desirability (15th) as well as importance (16th), but it is by far the least probable outcome (2.54--with a rank of 28) of the thrust of the coming five years.

New approaches to automobile traffic regulation in the city are also more wanted (11th on desirability) than expected (19th on likelihood, with an average of 4.99)--and somewhat less important (15th) than desirable. The odds, in terms of the average, are clearly just about fifty-fifty that something might be done, but this represents likelihood which is exceeded by 18 of the 28 items.

The development of a Rapid Transit System ranks among the most desirable options (4th, with an average of +1.54). It is seen somewhat likely over the five year time span, with an average of 6.00, but it ranks 11th in this regard among the questionnaire options. In importance, the Rapid Transit System ranks 3rd, behind the perceived need for new devices and techniques for pollution control (8.39 in importance), and new approaches to drug problems (8.38).

Reforms in the criminal justice system, too, are somewhat more wanted (6th) than they are likely (13th) but they are not quite as important (9th) to bring about as are many of the others, and more desirable, alternatives.

Innovations in labor union pacts and agreements (implying changes in the Philadelphia Plan or, more so, the Pittsburgh Plan type) also are somewhat more desirable (+1.02, ranking 17th) than probable (24th, with an average likelihood of 4.43, or relatively unlikely over the five years).

2. Likely But Less Desirable Options

Changes resulting from the completion of the Interstate Highway System in and around Pittsburgh are likely (6.79 average, ranking 6th among the twenty-eight alternatives), but their desirability, while still positive on the average, is quite low (+0.53, ranking 24th).

As a belated recognition, however, the wording of the item in the questionnaire leaves something to be desired: "Major changes in the direction of community development resulting from the completion of the Interstate Highway System in and around Pittsburgh." Under these circumstances, we cannot be sure whether the estimates of likelihood reflect primarily (a) the odds that the System will have been completed over the five year period, or (b) an assumption (as in the question, unfortunately) that the System will have been completed and the odds estimate the major changes that might be brought about, or (c) the joint likelihood of completion of the System and changes attendant to and in the aftermath of the completion.

Programs having to do with payment for health care services are somewhat more likely (5th) than wanted (12th), although their basic desirability, to the leaders, is not open to serious question.

New developments in low and middle-income housing, including housing for the aged, are also quite likely (4th, with an average of 6.89) and somewhat less wanted (+1.35, ranking 10th) in these relative terms. But again: reflecting upon the desirability scale (with its range from -2 to +2), it is obvious that an average of +1.35 represents a high value on the scale itself (yet, we repeat, lower than nine of the other futures in the list).

New anti-pollution regulation by laws is very likely with an average of 7.78, second only to the odds that new pollution control devices and techniques (likelihood of 7.81) will be developed. The desirability of legal approaches to the pollution problems is high (+1.40), but relatively lower (8th) than the chances that such measures will be taken, in fact. The discrepancy (2nd on likelihood and 8th on desirability) is not especially large (since the maximum difference could be one of 27 ranks), but it becomes more impressive in this particular instance due to the contrast with the non-legal approaches to pollution control. As has been said, the development of new devices and techniques is very likely (7.81, ranking 1st) and also very desirable +1.62, and ranking 1st)--and very important (8.39 average, and also ranking 1st).

This suggests not only that measures will be taken to fight pollution--many, of course, have already been taken over the years, and in escalating fashion recently--but that almost any measures will be acceptable although the community preference (that of the leaders) leans toward technical rather than legal steps. (To be sure, without the appropriate technology, it would seem unlikely that any legal steps as such could be workable; the difference here is one of emphasis).

The emergence, in significant fashion, of Black political power is more probable (14th) than desirable (20.5th, with an average of +0.95). Once again, the desirability is positive, though not very high (in terms of the scale and compared with other items). And furthermore, it is seen slightly more important (18th) than wanted.

3. Undesirable Options

Only two of the twenty-eight items yielded slightly negative averages. Both are unlikely. Both are considered relatively unimportant in terms of the community's priorities. One has to do with the possibility that welfare recipients might organize and express themselves as a political pressure group of considerable magnitude, or else might become a political pressure whether or not organized. The second alternative in this category concerns the possibility of a system by which tax relief or appropriate credit might be given to parents of school children so that they may select between public and private schooling ("Voucher" idea) without incurring double fiscal burden should they prefer private schools, and without having to forego the private school option if they cannot finance it (due to funds already provided for the public school system from their properties).

These two future possibilities, we repeat, are somewhat undesirable and they are also, at this time, not considered likely.

Before we look at the results with respect to the differences, and similarities, among the several groups of leaders--and before an interpretation is attempted--let us briefly consider the two remaining indices ("utility" and "worth") of the summary Table 11.

2. "UTILITY" AND "WORTH"

Some people may act exclusively, or predominantly (or at least, under some circumstances and on some occasions), on the basis of desirability. This means that they try to bring about the most wanted state of affairs regardless or almost regardless of its likelihood. In turn, some may be chiefly concerned with the preventing of some state of affairs, and they act on the basis of negative desirability, to prevent the coming about of the most undesirable situation. There are many qualifications to be made about these statements, but we will not delve into their underlying theory.

In contrast, some people may be primarily affected by expectations (that is, by situations to which they attach "certainty" or very high probability of occurrence). They may seek to adapt to the expected (certain, or extremely likely) "world." Again, the theoretical derivations and even their consequences need not concern us here.

Let us simply assume: some people tend to behave so as to bring about something they want to happen: others to prevent something unwanted from happening; still others, to adapt to expectations. This alone makes it valuable to treat the evaluative dimensions of desirability and likelihood separately. But there is considerable merit in a different (and complementary, not contradictory) view.

The "rational" man is not a victim of circumstances: (thus, he does not simply adapt to whatever may come about, or he may think will come about); nor does he blindly aim toward the ideal, acting on the most desirable, in face of recognition that he is unlikely to attain it; nor does he struggle to prevent something, by acting on highest undesirability, which might have only or modest low chances of happening. Hence, there is a fourth orientation that we can postulate, one which we do not necessarily consider "better" or "approve of more" than the others, even if we attach the label "rational" to it. The label is appropriate because it has been used in this context, and the "traditional economic man," for instance, can be seen as "rational" in terms which we propose to use.

The "rational" man, in simple terms, seeks to act so as to make his *expected payoff the greatest*, and it is "expected payoff under all circumstances simply because it deals with the always somewhat uncertain future. This payoff maximization has to do with yielding the highest *joint value and probability* associated with whatever may be at stake.

If we argue that the desirability index is a crude but reasonably acceptable measure of *value* (of the consequences of some state of affairs to the individual) *on the condition that the valued thing would, in fact, be realized*, then the *product* of desirability and likelihood will give us a clue to the expected payoff associated with each alternative. This is how the "utility" index was constructed. The term must remain in quotation marks because there are several violations involved here of the purer economic and mathematical concept of utility, and we do not pretend that the index of "utility" is equivalent to its conceptual counterparts. But it is *analogous*, and usefully so, if we are willing to grant the premise that desirability responses reflect relative value, and if, also, we are willing to grant that the likelihood estimates are *parallels* of the more precise and much more empirically elusive notion of subjective probabilities.

If desirability can range from (-2) to (+2), and likelihood ranges from (0) to (10), it follows that the "utility" index goes from (-20) to (+20). In column 4 of Table 11, these "utility" values were transformed onto a scale from (-100) to (+100), thus reading as a kind of "percentage" of maximum "utility" (100) or "disutility" (-100).

The worth index goes one step further. It weighs the "utility" (desirability times likelihood) by importance of each item, providing joint desirability, likelihood and importance estimates in something we have chosen to label "worth." Since importance was measured on a (0) to (10) scale, the index would range from (-200) to (+200). Like the "utility" measure, however, it was transformed to a (-100) to (100) scale in the 5th column of Table 11.

In this study, we would not expect the "utility" or, for that matter, "worth" measures to yield a drastically different ordering of the futures than that which has been obtained on the basis of each of the indices taken separately. This is, of course, once again due to the empirical result in terms of which the intercorrelations of the separate measures are high.

But this need not be the case, and usually, is not the case. The "utility" value of "innovations in the distribution and accessibility of health care services" is just about 50. It comes about because the desirability is (+1.51) and likelihood (6.70). But it would have been obtained had the option been less desirable (+1.00, for instance) and, at the same time, certain (likelihood of 10). It would have also come about with a likelihood of 8.00 and desirability of (+1.25), and so on. The same obvious examples could be given about the "worth" index.

The items with the highest "utility," and also "worth," are given, for convenience, in Table 12. It will be noted that they do not exactly reproduce the priorities as given by any one of the separate measures (of desirability, or likelihood, or importance). Anti-pollution laws are here in third position (though 8th in desirability and 7th in importance) because these developments have very high odds attached to them. In turn, Rapid Transit, 4th in desirability and 3rd in importance, does not appear on this list of five futures with the highest utility and worth (Table 12) because of its relatively lower likelihood.

TABLE 12

FUTURES WITH HIGHEST UTILITY AND WORTH

	"Utility"	"Worth"*
Innovations in waste disposal and air and water pollution control devices	63.2	53.1
Reorganization of public welfare agencies and programs	55.3	45.8
The development of new laws governing air and water pollution control	54.4	48.8
Introduction of new approaches regarding the use of drugs	52.2	43.8
Innovation in the distribution and accessibility of health care services	50.1	41.7

*The reader will immediately realize that the "worth" index values will always be lower than those of the "utility" measure because a third variable (importance) is used in the multiplication which produces the index. "Worth" = "Utility," of course, where the importance is 10.

This is as it should be: it is more of a demanding test for something to be: (a) desired, (b) likely, and (c) important, than to be only (a) desired and (b) likely.

It is very tempting to say, in fact, that if one were hard put to choose five priorities for a community-wide thrust (to evaluate specific measures to be taken, to consider their implications, to adopt such measures as chosen, and to implement them), Table 12 gives the candidates with the highest community payoff as seen in the Spring of 1971 by at least those leaders who have participated in the study.

The next two items include:

(a) New developments in low and middle-income housing, including housing for the aged (with "utility" of 46.7 and "worth," 37.6),

(b) Rapid Transit System ("utility" of 46.2 and "worth," 38.2).

And one more step: the very next issue has to do with payment for medical and health services ("utility, 44.0, and "worth," 38.7).

Hence, the eight highest priority items involve pollution, community health, housing, and reconsideration of the established systems for providing welfare benefits. This kind of an agenda is sufficiently large, as well as compelling, to occupy a good portion of the community leadership for a good deal of time.

Yet, what differences are there if we consider the interests and estimates of the various groups of leaders, rather than treating all of them as if they were undifferentiated in their perspectives, or in their needs? This is the next task before us.

3. PERSPECTIVES OF GROUPS OF LEADERS

To facilitate the discussion, Tables 13-22 provide summary information for each of the ten groups of leaders: Government and Law, Business, Education, Health and Welfare, Housing and Urban Development, Black Community Programs, Anti-Poverty Programs, Religion (Social Service Programs), Environment Control and Mass Media. The remaining few leaders who fell into the category of "others" are not included here mainly because this category is a mixed one.

Only the five most desirable, most likely, most important items are given in the tables, except for those instances in which the average value may be the same for several futures. In such cases, all "tied" items are tabulated as well. Similarly, the five items with highest "utility" and highest "worth" are included in the tables.

TABLE 13

MOST DESIRABLE, MOST LIKELY, AND MOST IMPORTANT ISSUES: LEADERS IN GOVERNMENT AND LAW

Desirability		Likelihood		Importance	
Reform of criminal justice system	+1.80	Anti-pollution laws	8.13	Rapid Transit	8.67
Rapid Transit	+1.80	Drug use	7.27	Drug use	8.60
Drug use	+1.67	Pollution control devices	7.07	Reform of criminal justice system	8.60
New business and industry	+1.60	Payment for health services programs	6.67	New business and industry	8.40
Anti-pollution laws	+1.60	Completion of Interstate Highway System	6.58	Black community's economic development	8.27

"Utility"		"Worth"	
Anti-pollution laws	65.0	Anti-pollution laws	52.4
Approaches to drug use	61.7	Approaches to drug use	52.2
Criminal justice reform	55.6	Criminal justice reform	48.6
Rapid Transit	55.2	Rapid Transit	47.8
Pollution Control Devices	53.0	Pollution Control Devices	42.0

TABLE 14

MOST DESIRABLE, MOST LIKELY, AND MOST IMPORTANT ISSUES: BUSINESS LEADERS

Desirability		Likelihood		Importance	
Business tax climate	+1.69	Pollution control devices	8.62	New business and industry	9.08
Public welfare programs and agencies	+1.62	Anti-pollution laws	8.15	Business tax climate	8.69
Drug use	+1.62	Interstate Highway System	8.08	Rapid Transit	8.23
Pollution control devices	+1.62	Public welfare agencies	7.62	Drug use	8.23
New business and industry	+1.46	Low and middle-income housing	7.46	Pollution control devices	8.15
Rapid Transit*	+1.46				

"Utility"		"Worth"	
Anti-pollution devices	69.8	Anti-pollution devices	56.9
Reforms of welfare agencies and programs	61.7	Reform of welfare agencies and programs	47.7
Low and middle income housing (and aged)	51.4	Approaches to drug use	42.0
Approaches to drug use	51.1	Low and middle income housing (and aged)	41.6
Rapid Transit	43.2	Tax Climate	35.6
		Rapid Transit	35.5**

*Due to the "tie" in average value, the 6th priority is also given.

**Because the resulting values are so close to each other, the "worth" of the Rapid Transit System was also given though it ranks 6th.

TABLE 15

MOST DESIRABLE, MOST LIKELY, AND MOST IMPORTANT ISSUES: LEADERS IN EDUCATION

Desirability		Likelihood		Importance	
Drug use	+1.54	Pollution control devices	8.00	Drug use	8.91
Reforms of public welfare agencies and programs	+1.50	Drug use	7.73	Pollution control devices	8.64
Health care and services delivery	+1.45	Payment for health services	7.56	Health care and services delivery	8.45
Reform of public school programs	+1.40	Reform of public welfare agencies and programs	7.50	Reform of public school programs	8.20
New business and industry*	+1.36	Anti-pollution laws	7.50	Reform of public welfare agencies and programs	8.10
Black community development	+1.36				
Pollution control devices	+1.36				
Anti-pollution laws	+1.36				
Rapid Transit	+1.36				

"Utility"		"Worth"	
Approaches to drug use	59.5	Approaches to drug use	53.0
Welfare agencies and programs reform	56.2	Pollution control devices	47.0
Pollution control devices	55.2	Welfare agencies and programs reform	45.6
Health services distribution and availability	53.2	Health services distribution and availability	44.9
Reform of public school programs	46.2	Reform of public school programs	37.9

*Again, due to "ties," all items are cited.

TABLE 16

MOST DESIRABLE, MOST LIKELY, AND MOST IMPORTANT ISSUES: HEALTH AND WELFARE LEADERS

Desirability		Likelihood		Importance	
Black community's economic development	+1.91	Pollution control devices	8.00	Black community's economic development	9.18
Pollution control devices	+1.82	Low and middle-income housing	7.82	Pollution control devices	9.09
Health services delivery	+1.82	Payment for health services programs	7.73	Low and middle-income housing	9.00
Reform of criminal justice systems*	+1.73	Reform of public welfare agencies and programs	7.73	Reform in public school programs*	8.91
Anti-pollution laws	+1.73	Anti-pollution laws	7.73	Health services delivery	8.91
Low and middle-income housing	+1.73			Drug use	8.91

"Utility"		"Worth"	
Pollution control devices	72.8	Pollution control devices	66.2
Economic development of Black community	67.7	Economic development of Black community	62.2
Low and middle-income housing	67.6	Low and middle-income housing	60.9
Anti-pollution laws	66.8	Anti-pollution laws	58.9
Health services distribution and availability	65.4	Health services distribution and availability	58.2

*"Ties" in terms of averages make us include all such items.

TABLE 17

MOST DESIRABLE, MOST LIKELY, AND MOST IMPORTANT ISSUES: HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT LEADERS

Desirability		Likelihood		Importance	
New business and industry	+1.71	Anti-pollution laws	7.86	Low and middle-income housing	8.86
Low and middle-income housing	+1.57	Low and middle-income housing	6.86	Anti-pollution laws	8.43
Rapid Transit	+1.57	Interstate Highways	6.43	New revenue sources	8.28
Criminal justice reform	+1.43*	Drug use	6.28	Pollution control devices	8.28
New revenue sources	+1.43	Pollution control devices	6.28	Rapid Transit	8.28
Pollution control devices	+1.43				
Anti-pollution laws	+1.43				

"Utility"		"Worth"	
Anti-pollution laws	56.2	New low and middle-income housing	47.7
New low and middle-income housing	53.8	Anti-pollution laws	47.4
Pollution control devices	44.9	Pollution control devices	37.2
Rapid Transit System	42.6	Rapid Transit System	35.2
New revenue sources for city	41.9	New revenue sources for city	34.7

TABLE 18

MOST DESIRABLE, MOST LIKELY, AND MOST IMPORTANT ISSUES: LEADERS OF BLACK COMMUNITY PROGRAMS

Desirability		Likelihood		Importance	
Criminal justice reforms	+1.67	Interstate Highways	7.60	Drug use	8.67
Anti-pollution laws	+1.67	Pollution control devices	7.50	Reform of public welfare agencies and programs	8.17
Metropolitan Government	+1.60	Development of East Liberty type	7.00	Health services delivery	8.17
Health services delivery	+1.50	Anti-pollution laws	6.83	Criminal justice reforms	7.83
Drug use	+1.50	Payment for health services	6.80	Anti-pollution laws	7.83

"Utility"		"Worth"	
Anti-pollution laws	57.0	Anti-pollution laws	44.6
Health services distribution and availability	45.0	Approaches to drug use	37.9
Pollution control devices	43.9	Health services distribution and availability	36.8
Approaches to drug use	43.7	Reform of public welfare agencies and programs	33.6
Reform of public welfare agencies and programs	41.0	Reform of criminal justice system	28.8

TABLE 19

MOST DESIRABLE, MOST LIKELY, AND MOST IMPORTANT ISSUES: LEADERS OF ANTI-POVERTY PROGRAMS

Desirability		Likelihood		Importance	
Pollution control devices	+1.82	Pollution control devices	8.00	Reform of public school programs	9.44
Reform of public welfare agencies and programs	+1.73	Health services delivery	7.73	Pollution control devices	9.20
Drug use	+1.73	Interstate Highways	7.73	Reform of public welfare agencies and programs	9.00
Rapid Transit	+1.64	Anti-pollution laws	7.45	Rapid Transit	9.00
Automobile traffic*	+1.54	Low and middle-income housing	7.36	New revenue sources	8.60
New business and industry	+1.54				
Health services delivery	+1.54				

"Utility"		"Worth"	
Pollution control devices	72.8	Pollution control devices	67.0
Reform of public welfare agencies and programs	60.6	Reform of public welfare agencies and programs	54.5
Health services distribution and availability	59.5	Health services distribution and availability	50.6
Approaches to drug use	55.8	Low and middle-income housing	44.3
Low and middle-income housing	53.4	Approaches to drug use	43.2

*Items involved in a "tie" are all given.

TABLE 20

MOST DESIRABLE, MOST LIKELY, AND MOST IMPORTANT ISSUES: LEADERS OF RELIGIOUS SOCIAL SERVICE PROGRAMS

Desirability		Likelihood		Importance	
Reform of public welfare agencies and programs	+2.00	Anti-pollution laws	8.25	Reform of public school programs	9.18
Pollution control devices	+1.83	Pollution control devices	8.00	Reform of criminal justice system	9.00
Reform of criminal justice system	+1.75	Drug use	7.92	Reform of public welfare agencies and programs	9.00
Reform of public school programs	+1.73	Reform of public welfare agencies and programs	7.58	Anti-pollution laws	8.75
Metropolitan Government*	+1.67	Reform of public school programs	7.09	Pollution control devices	9.00
Drug use	+1.67				

"Utility"		"Worth"	
Reform of public welfare agencies and programs	75.8	Reform of public welfare agencies and programs	68.2
Pollution control devices	73.2	Pollution control devices	65.9
Approaches to drug use	66.2	Reform of public school programs	59.6
Anti-pollution laws	66.0	Anti-pollution laws	57.8
Reform of public school programs	65.0	Approaches to drug use	54.6

*All "tied" items are given here.

TABLE 21

MOST DESIRABLE, MOST LIKELY, AND MOST IMPORTANT ISSUES: LEADERS IN ENVIRONMENT CONTROL ACTIVITIES

Desirability		Likelihood		Importance	
Reform of public welfare agencies and programs	+2.00	Pollution control devices	9.40	Health services delivery	9.25
Pollution control devices	+1.80	Reform of public school programs	8.[illegible]0	Payment for health services	9.25
Reform of public school programs	+1.80	Anti-pollution laws	8.20	Reform of private welfare agencies and programs	9.25
Health services delivery	+1.75	Reform of public welfare agencies and programs	8.20	Reform of public welfare agencies and programs	9.00
Payment for health services	+1.75	Health services delivery	8.00	Development of Black political power	9.00

"Utility"		"Worth"	
Pollution control devices	84.6	Reform of public welfare agencies and programs	73.8
Reform of public welfare agencies and programs	82.0	Pollution control devices	72.8
Reform of public school programs	75.6	Reform of public school programs	66.5
Health services distribution and availability	70.0	Health services distribution and availability	64.8
Payment for health services	67.8	Payment for health services	62.7

TABLE 22

MOST DESIRABLE, MOST LIKELY, AND MOST IMPORTANT ISSUES: LEADERS OF PITTSBURGH'S MEDIA

Desirability		Likelihood		Importance	
Drug use	+1.80	Rapid Transit	8.20	Drug use	8.50
Health services delivery	+1.70	Pollution control devices	7.60	Health services delivery	8.50
Pollution control devices	+1.60	Anti-pollution laws	7.60	Long-term investment patterns	8.25
New business and industry	+1.60	Payment for health services	7.50	Reform of public welfare agencies and programs	8.20
Tax climate*	+1.56	Drug use	7.50	Payment for health services	8.10
Rapid Transit	+1.56				

"Utility"		"Worth"	
Approaches to drug use	67.5	Approaches to drug use	57.4
Rapid Transit System	64.0	Rapid Transit System	47.6
Pollution control devices	60.8	Health services distribution and availability	47.0
Anti-pollution laws	57.0	Anti-pollution laws	45.6
Payment for health services	56.2	Pollution control devices	45.6

*"Tied" items are included.

Seven of the twenty-eight questionnaire items do not appear in any of the tables (13 through 22). These include:

(a) Changes in media coverage of Pittsburgh events--seen rather unimportant by all groups of leaders; generally somewhat unlikely anyway (Anti-Poverty and Environment Control leaders assign likelihood in excess of the mid-point, 6.38 and 6.00 respectively, as do Business leaders, 5.38, and Media leaders, 5.10); and of relatively lower, though positive, desirability (although Environment Control leaders assign an average of +1.40 to this item, and Media leaders, themselves, +1.10).

(b) Changes in Union pacts and agreements--seen rather important by Media leaders (7.90, ranking 7th among them), and Black Community Program leaders (7.50, ranking 8th) but less important by other groups; fairly unlikely, except for Educators (6.10 average, ranking 10th), Media leaders (5.80, though ranking 16th), and Business leaders (5.25, ranking, however 22nd); and not as desirable as 16 other options among the twenty-eight (the average for Media leaders is, however, +1.40, ranking 12th).

(c) Changes in Union direction--25th in importance for all leaders; somewhat unlikely, though Business leaders average 6.77 (ranking 9th), Media leaders, 6.10 (14th), and Anti-Poverty Program leaders, 5.89 (14th as well); and of low desirability (26th for the whole group of respondents), never exceeding +1.00 on balance for any group, and negative, -.50, for Business leaders.

(d) Changes in Board of Education--24th in importance, and, compared with the other groups, seen significantly more important only by leaders in Religious Social Service Programs (7.50, ranking 14th), and Black Community Programs leadership (6.83, ranking 15th); somewhat unlikely; and low in desirability, particularly among Educators themselves (+0.10, ranking 25.5th).

(e) New programs in the direction of racial integration--fairly important (14th for all leaders), and particularly important to

Anti-Poverty leaders (8.20, ranking 8th), Educators (7.91 and ranking 9th), and Housing and Urban Development leaders (7.57, ranking also 9th), though much less important to Black Community Program leaders (6.00, ranking 22nd); somewhat more likely than not (average 5.46, ranking 15th), especially as seen by Businessmen (7.23, ranking 6.5th) and Media leaders (6.78, ranking 8th); and rather desirable, although the Black Programs' leaders assign an average desirability of 0.00 (zero) to this notion.

(f) "Voucher" system idea--unimportant, unlikely, and somewhat undesirable anyway.

(g) Development of political power among welfare recipients--unimportant, somewhat unlikely, and, basically, on the average, neither desired nor unwanted.

Five of the futures are mentioned only once among the items presented in Tables 13-22. These are:

(a) The need for reconsidering the community's patterns of long-term investment is among the five most important issues evaluated by the Media leaders. But they rate it low in desirability (+0.33), and Business leaders come up with an average negative desirability value (-0.09). To all the groups, except the Media leaders, this is a rather unimportant problem at this time, and something unlikely to come about as well (seen somewhat likely, 5.54, only by Business leaders--who, it will be recalled, are not favorably disposed to the idea in the first place).

(b) Development of Black political power is among the most important issues among the Environment Control leaders. More than any other group, they also consider this a desirable thrust (+1.50, ranking 10.5th). Among the Black Community Program leaders, the item ranks 10th in desirability (+1.17), 13.5 in likelihood (5.50), and 18th in importance (6.88).

(c) The Environment Control leaders also are the only group which attaches high importance, that is, among the top five, to the need for changes in private welfare agencies and programs; they also consider the need for changes in public programs (and agencies) of extreme importance and in this, their view is shared by many others. This means, of course, that this particular group of leaders is concerned with the welfare system as a whole, with its public and private components.

To be sure, the postulated change in private welfare efforts is rather desirable to all groups; for instance, yielding an average of +1.60, and ranking 9th, among the Health and Welfare leadership; +1.25, and ranking 15.5th, among leaders of Religious, hence, private social welfare programs; and 1.14, 13.5th, among the Housing and Urban Development leaders.

But the importance which Environment Control leaders attribute to the idea is not shared by others--it ranks 20th for the leaders as a whole (13th among Black Community Program leaders, with an average importance of 7.00; and 12.5th among Housing and Urban Development leaders, with an average of 7.28).

(d) Black Community Program leaders consider developmental efforts of the East Liberty variety among the five most likely transformations of the Pittsburgh community. But in desirability, it ranks 18th among them (average of +0.83), and is even somewhat unwanted (-0.20) by the Environment Control leadership, and does not yield a desirability average in excess of (+1.00) in any one of the groups. Although the average likelihood suggests that such Pittsburgh developments seem somewhat probable (5.35, ranking 17th) no group comes even close to the Black Community leaders in attaching relatively high likelihood to this item.

(e) The desirability of regulating automotive traffic in Pittsburgh is among the six issues particularly stressed by leaders of Anti-Poverty programs. Every group of leaders, of course, considers this to be a desirable development, and even a very much wanted one.

But the point is, that it does not rate as high, relatively, as many other alternatives. It is 7.5th among Environment Control leaders, 10th among Educators (+1.30) and Government leaders (+1.33)--and the relatively lowest evaluation comes from Housing and Urban Development leaders (19.5th with an average of +0.86, the only average which falls below +1.00). The odds are seen to be just about fifty-fifty for the leaders as a total group: Environment Control (6.80), Business (6.38), and Education (6.22) leaders assigned highest likelihood; leaders of Religious Social Programs (3.75) and Government leaders (4.00), the lowest.

In importance, this option ranks 15th in the aggregate of leaders--9th, the highest, among Environment Control leaders (8.20), and 20.5th (the lowest) among religious leaders (7.17).

Several of the futures show up in the summary tables (13-22). only a few times.

(a) Metropolitan Government is among the most desirable options for Black Community Program leaders and for leaders of Religious Social Service Programs. In turn, leaders in Anti-Poverty efforts (+0.70, 22nd in rank), Media leaders (+0.90 and 21.5th in rank), and Environment Control leaders (+1.00 and 21.5th in rank) see it as less desirable than do the other groups. Among Government leaders, the development of Metropolitan Government ranks 13th in desirability (average of +1.17).

Of the twenty-eight items in the listing, this is the least likely prospect for Housing and Urban Development (0.86), Government (2.80), Anti-Poverty (2.60), Religion (2.42), and it is as unlikely as another improbable option, the "Voucher" system, among Businessmen (2.08), Educators (1.36), and Health and Welfare (2.54) leadership. In fact, the 26th rank in likelihood for the Environment Control and Media leaders is its highest.

(b) Economic development of the Black Community ranks among the most desirable options for Educators (+1.36 tied for 5th ranking with four other alternatives, viz., Table 15), and for Health and Welfare leaders (+1.91), for whom this is the most desirable item of all twenty-eight. Government leaders and Health and Welfare leaders also rate the need for economic progress among the community's Blacks among the most important issues. Media leaders consider it, however, 19th in importance (7.22 average), yet, in turn, they thought that the development of Black political power was substantially more important (9th, with 7.78 as average), perhaps, implying an instrumental relationship in which political power (first order of business in this domain of problems) might well induce economic growth as well as racial integration (ranking, as we have shown, 18th in importance with an average of 7.33).

Black Community Program leaders view economic development of the Black rather unlikely (3.83, ranking 24.5th), and much more unlikely than the other groups of leaders consider it to be. Religious leaders (6.83, ranking 6.5th), Business leaders (6.62, ranking 11th), Health and Welfare leaders (7.09, ranking 10th) assign particularly higher likelihood to this prospect.

(c) The development of new revenue sources for the community is among both most desired and most important issues to the Housing and Urban Development leaders; it is also in the group of five most important issues among the leaders of Anti-Poverty programs. Black Community Program leaders, while positive, are the least favorable of all groups (+0.67, ranking 22nd), and the leaders in the city's Media also are not particularly enthusiastic (+1.00, ranking 19.5th). That such new sources of revenue will be forthcoming is seen as fairly likely (5.89, ranking 12th, as an average for all the leaders). Particularly the leaders in Health and Welfare (7.27, 6th), Environment Control (6.80, 10th), Business (6.92, 8th), Black Community Programs (6.33, 7th), Government (6.20, 8th), and Housing and Urban Development (5.86, 6th) are inclined to feel that this might, indeed, happen in the course of the next five years.

(d) Major changes in the tax climate, especially as it pertains to business and economic development programs, rank among the most desirable and most important options for the community's Business leaders. Media leaders also consider the prospect among the five most desirable ones.

In turn, while positive, the desirability of this item is particularly low among Black Community Program leaders (+0.33, ranking 26th), Anti-Poverty program leaders (+0.40, ranking 25th), Environment Control leaders (+0.25, ranking 25.5th), Government (+0.86, ranking 18th), and Educators (+0.60, ranking 23rd). It is one of the two least likely prospects (the second one being, again, the "voucher" idea) for Environment Control leaders (2.50 average, ranking 27.5th), and quite low, at least in terms of ranks, among the Buinsessmen (4.23, ranking 26th) who, of course, consider it highly desirable. The highest likelihood is assigned by the leaders from Religious Social Services (6.50, ranking 10th), and Media leaders (6.44, ranking 12th).

Very important to Business leaders, the item is relatively unimportant from the vantage point of Environment Control (6.00, ranking 25th), Religion (7.17, ranking 20.5th), and Government (6.09, ranking 22nd), although, indeed, these scale values, relative to the scale itself rather than relative to the alternatives, tend to be uniformly quite high.

Next, we may consider those futures which several groups of leaders thought to be among the most desirable ones or among the most likely ones, or else, both most wanted and most important. Seven of the remaining twelve outcomes can be so interpreted.

(a) The completion of the Interstate Highway System with its impact on the community's development is considered to be one of the most likely futures by Government, Business, Housing and Urban Development, Black Community Programs, and Anti-Poverty program leaders. On the whole (for all leaders), this item ranks 6th in likelihood (6.79 average), and the lowest likelihood, 5.80 (ranking 15th) is assigned to it by leaders of Religious Social Service Programs. Educators rated it 12th, with an average of 5.88.

But this likely prospect is among the less desired ones--no desirability value exceeds +1.00, and it reaches this value only among the Anti-Poverty leaders (and ranks 17th), and among the Education leaders (ranking, in turn, 17.5th). At the same time, it is seen as relatively unimportant, with 22 of the options being more important than this one.

(b) Growth of new business and industry in the community ranks among the most desired futures for six of the ten groups of leaders: Government, Business, Education, Housing and Urban Development, Anti-Poverty Programs, and Media leaders.

The desirability is +0.83 among the Black Community Program leaders (ranking 18th), +1.00 among the religious leaders (ranking 20.5th), +1.40 among the Environment Control leaders (ranking 14.5th), and +1.64 among the Health and Welfare leaders (though ranking 7.5th). As desirable as it is to the Pittsburgh leaders that new business and industry should be brought to the community, it is also improbable. Likelihood in excess of fifty-fifty odds is attached to this prospect only by Health and Welfare leaders (5.54, ranking 18th), and Religious leaders (5.33, ranking 17.5th). Business leaders in fact are the least optimistic of all of the groups (4.23 and rank, 26th).

Government and Business leaders also rate this item among the most important issues: for Business leaders, it ranks paramount in importance (with an average of 9.08), and it is fourth for the Government leaders (8.40 average). The lowest relative importance is attached by the Black Community Program leaders (6.17 ranking 20th). In no other group does the estimated importance fall below 7.00 and it exceeds the index value of 8.00 among Housing and Urban Development leaders (8.14, ranking 6th) and Health and Welfare leaders (8.54, ranking 10.5th).

(c) Major *changes in the administration of criminal justice* are among the most desired and also most important options for several of the groups. Such changes are most desired by the Health and Welfare and Housing and Urban Development leaders, and they are *both* most desired and most important from the viewpoint of Government, Black Community Programs, and Religious Social Services leadership.

Among the remaining community leaders, reforms in the criminal justice system, desirable as they are, do not tend to be stressed nearly as much. Anti-Poverty leaders, for instance, yield an average of +1.00, implicitly ranking this item 17th, and Environment Control leaders, +1.20, ranking it 17.5th. Although Housing and Urban Development leaders view these changes as very desirable and among the most wanted ones, eighteen other items exceed the criminal justice system issue in importance (6.43 average, 19th rank). Black Community Program leaders, who have assigned the problem both high desirability and high importance are the least optimistic that the wanted changes that might be called for will come about. The likelihood is 4.40, ranking 20th. This is the only likelihood value which falls below the mid-point of fifty-fifty. It also ranks 20th among Business (5.46 average), Education (5.18 average), and aedia (5.40 average) leaders.

(d) The *Rapid Transit System* is among the most desired and also most important developments for leaders of Government, Business, Housing and Urban Development, and Media. It is also among the most wanted changes for Educators, and the Media leaders consider it among the likeliest ones. At the same time, the Anti-Poverty Program leaders think it rather unlikely (average of 4.82, 21st rank) and the highest odds attached to this option--except for the Media leaders (8.20, ranking 1st)--is 6.25, ranking 12.5th among the leaders of Religious Social Service Programs. It ranks 7.5th for the Housing and Urban Development leaders (5.43) and 9th for Government (6.13), the latter being particularly noteworthy since Government leaders rated both desirability and importance exceptionally high.

(e) Changes in ways of paying for medical care and services are thought to be among the likeliest five-year transformations on the part of Government, Education, Health and Welfare, Black Community Program, and Media leaders. Environment Control leaders also view these efforts among the most desired and most important ones, and Media leaders saw it among the most important.

Desirability, while very high, is relatively lowest among Business (+1.00, 15.5th), Housing and Urban Development (+1.14, 13.5th), Education (+1.20, 13th) and Government (+1.20, 12th) leaders.

Likelihood is generally high; the lowest average amounts to 5.43 (and ranking 7.5th) among the Housing and Urban Development leaders, and the lowest rank being 12.5th (average of 6.25) among the leaders of Religious Social Service Programs.

(f) Low and middle-income housing, including housing for the aged, is considered among the likeliest developments on the part of Business, Health and Welfare, Housing and Urban Development, and Anti-Poverty Program leaders. It is also among the most desired and most important issues for the Health and Welfare, and Housing and Urban Development leadership. To be sure, had we included systematically six, rather than five, top items throughout the tables, the desirability--and likelihood--of new housing for lower and middle income Pittsburgh inhabitants would have fallen into this top group for Government leaders as well (desirability: +1.57, ranking 6th, likelihood: 6.43 and also ranking 6th). Media leaders, too, view this very likely (7.30, ranking 6th), and very desirable (+1.50, ranking 8.5th).

Only Black Community Program leaders (desirability: +1.00, ranking 14th, likelihood: 5.67, ranking 11.5th) and Education leaders (desirability +1.18, ranking 14.5th, likelihood: 6.10, ranking 10.5th), as well as Environment Control leaders (likelihood: 6.80, ranking 10th, and desirability: +1.20, ranking 17.5th) tend to be somewhat lower in their evaluations than are the other groups. But on the whole, programs for the development of new housing for these categories of Pittsburghers are seen as very desirable, quite likely, and quite important.

(g) Changes in programs and curricula of public schools are among the most desired and most important issues for the Educators and for leaders of Religious Social Service Programs. Religious leaders also consider such changes among the most likely developments, as do leaders from Environment Control efforts (who also rate reforms of public schools among the most desired, though not most important, items). Finally, Anti-Poverty Program leaders assign this issue one of the highest importance values, though not desirabilities (+1.40, ranking 10th), or likelihood (average of 6.00, ranking 12.5th). Leaders of Business (desirability +0.82, ranking 20th) and Government (desirability +0.85, ranking 19.5th) are not only relatively lower in desirability, but also in importance evaluations (6.18, ranking 21st for Business leaders, and 6.64, ranking 18th for Government). Likelihood of such reforms is particularly low among the Black Community Program leaders (4.33, ranking 22nd--and the only value below the mid-point), although desirability is high (+1.33, ranking 6.5th).

The five remaining items appear quite frequently among the most wanted, most important, and most likely developments.

(a) New systems of delivery of health care (that is, its distribution and accessibility) appear in the desirability and importance tables for Educators, Health and Welfare, Black Community Program, Environment Control and Media leaders. They also are considered among the most desired changes by Anti-Poverty Program leaders who, at the same time, view such developments among the likely ones, as do leaders of Environment Control programs.

No likelihood assessment falls below 6.00--except for the Housing and Urban Development leaders (4.28, ranking 15.5th) who believe that new payment methods for health services are more probable in coming (5.43, ranking 7.5th).

Importance, too, is uniformly high. The lowest value, 7.43 (ranking 10.5th) occurs again among the Housing and Urban Development leaders as does the lowest, though still high, desirability average (+1.28, ranking 10th).

(b) Reorganization of public welfare agencies and programs is viewed among the most desirable, most important, and most likely changes on the part of Education, Religion, and Environment Control leaders. Furthermore, it is also among the most important issues on the community's agenda--and among the most wanted changes--by the Anti-Poverty leadership. In importance, the evaluations of Black Community Program and Media leaders also place the issue among the central ones. Business leaders, in turn, consider it among the most desired and most likely prospects. Finally, reforms of public welfare programs and agencies are seen among the most likely developments by the Health and Welfare leaders, who, however, do not rate desirability particularly high (+0.71, ranking 21.5th).

(c) Three groups of leaders believe new approaches to drug use and attendant problems to be among the most desired, most important, and most likely prospects: Government, Educators, and Media leaders. For Business leaders, and Black Community leaders, this issue appears among the most desired and most important ones. Both groups, however, consider it less probable than do others. Black Program leaders assign an average of 5.83 (10th rank), and Business leaders, 6.31 (13th rank). Leaders in Religious-Social Service Programs place the need for new approaches to the drug problem among the most desirable and also most likely changes. It also is evaluated among the most wanted efforts by Anti-Poverty Program leaders, whereas Health and Welfare leaders think it to be among the most important ones.

(d) The development of new laws bearing on problems of pollution comes up among the most desired thrusts for Government, Education, Health and Welfare, Housing and Urban Development, and Black Community Program leaders. The latter two groups and also the leaders of Religious Social Service Programs consider this among the most important developments as well. All groups of leaders place new anti-pollution laws among the most likely changes over the five year period.

Only leaders of Business assign a relatively low, though positive, desirability to legal approaches to environment control (+0.69, ranking 22nd)--but the development of innovations in waste disposal and of anti-pollution devices rates very high among them (+1.62, ranking 3rd). Compared with the other groups of leaders, the Business leaders (6.54, ranking 18th), Anti-Poverty Program leaders (7.00, ranking 18.5th), and Environment Control leaders themselves (7.60, ranking 15.5th), rate the importance of legal measures much lower.

(e) Innovations in waste disposal and air and water pollution control devices are among the five most desired efforts by all groups of leaders--except for Government leaders (for whom the desirability is +1.50, very high in scale terms, and the rank is 7th, high indeed among the 28 options). In importance, pollution control devices come up among the five key issues for leaders of Business, Education, Health and Welfare, Anti-Poverty programs, and Religion. All groups of leaders, much as has been the case with anti-pollution laws, believe such developments to be quite likely.

III

ADVICE AND CONCERN

1. INTRODUCTION

In addition to assessing the likelihood, desirability and importance of each of the 28 issues over a five-year period, the leaders were asked to select three of the issues, or for that matter more if they desired, and to identify the kinds of things that need to be done about them, the things to be avoided, whether such steps seem likely over the coming five-year period, and which segments or organizations of the community might hold views similar to and at odds with their own position.

It turns out that a little over 70 percent of the leaders were willing to give their time to this open-ended section of the questionnaire. In this part of the report we will discuss the advice given, and concern shown, with regard to the various issues to which the leaders reacted. The order in which the futures appear reflects the frequency with which each issue was rejoined in the open-ended part of the questionnaire: this order is somewhat different from the importance rankings obtained numerically, and it is also a little different from the "utility" or "worth" orderings previously cited. We will have occasion to speculate about the reasons for these seeming inconsistencies in priorities in conjunction with the specific issues to be considered.

2. METROPOLITAN GOVERNMENT

All in all, 30 of the leaders (28 percent) chose to elaborate some of their views on the Metropolitan Government concept. Indeed, 28 of them selected this issue as the highest priority, and the remaining two, as the third item on which they commented.

From the quantitative results of the study, we know that emergence of a Metropolitan Government was quite desirable (community consensus issue by the "acceptance index" with more than two-thirds but fewer than 90 percent of the leaders attaching positive value to it)--but it was seen also quite unlikely. Desirable but unlikely futures would tend to be a source of significant frustration if the evaluation were coupled with a sense that there is not much that can be done, or at least, attempted.

We would have so interpreted the data regarding Metropolitan Government if only very few leaders had chosen to discuss the kinds of steps that might be taken, but this clearly was not the case. Connected with a feeling that something practical could be done, or attempted, the desired but unlikely (not only in terms of the metropolitan government item discussed here, but in more general terms) is a potential mobilizing issue, a challenge, if you wish, much more so than was something both wanted and probable.

While the importance index shows the metropolitan government item ranking 16th (with a numerical average of 7.16), we find that those who are either neutral toward it or even consider it undesirable (15 leaders) yield an importance average of only 4.80, while those remaining who are receptive to the idea, 7.64.

Most of the leaders believe the "proliferation of local governments" (as one of them puts it specifically), over 120 of them in our area, to be inefficient, wasteful and far too costly, while the area problems are similar and are shared with the City of Pittsburgh itself. They point out that inequitable cost sharing, differences in standards and in law enforcement, duplication of effort, multiple taxing burdens on the citizenry, and even a somewhat low quality of political leadership throughout the area are among the costs associated with the continuation of the present system. But all are not entirely convinced that metropolitan governance would necessarily lead to the lowering of financial costs. A most cogent statement of caution comes from a member of the Judiciary, and the salient points are reproduced here verbatim:

> I believe that metropolitan government for Allegheny County would be desirable. However, before endorsing it, I think a study should be made as to the additional cost to the taxpayer, if any. I am sure that many persons assume that County-wide government would cost less than the many subdivisions we now have. I am not convinced of this.
>
> 1. Fire protection in the City of Pittsburgh and possibly a few of the smaller subdivisions of the County have paid fire departments, but in many of the subdivisions, fire protection is furnished by unpaid, volunteer firemen. If a paid fire department were to be extended County-wide, it appears to me that the cost for this service would be much more than it now is.
>
> 2. Police protection. While I am sure that every subdivision in the County has some form of police protection, I do believe that if we had a County-wide police department that the demands would be such that the cost of police protection would increase to an amount greater than is now spent on this service.
>
> 3. Recreational facilities. Certain sections of the County, including the City of Pittsburgh, have many recreational facilities, but in many subdivisions, there are practically none. The demand for recreational facilities under a metropolitan city would increase tremendously if the metropolitan government were to attempt to operate such facilities in every section of the County. (Questionnaire #01102)

The suggestion that a first step should involve _a study_ of the cost-benefits (human as well as financial) also is made by another leader who feels that systematic information should be made available (by the universities with foundation backing, he suggests) about experiences with metropolitan governance elsewhere throughout the United States. The study also should lead to recommendations as to _how_ metropolitanism could best be introduced into the particular context of our own area. Most leaders, however, are sufficiently convinced of the worthwhileness of metropolitan government not to suggest the need for study, but rather, to emphasize _educational efforts_ (in one instance, referred to as _public relations_ efforts) to enlighten the population--especially outside of the City itself--about the pros and cons of metropolitanism.

Partial measures, as the first step(s), are advocated by many:

(a) agreements on joint purchasing, and the like, could begin to be made almost immediately;

(b) clusters of services could begin to be integrated so as to demonstrate what could be done: police and fire services, sewage (generally, waste disposal systems), recreational services, street repairs and maintenance and water are among the most frequently mentioned prospects.

Indeed, many of the leaders would explicitly, or at least by implication, endorse the kind of statement which comes from one of the community's leading businessmen:

> . . . I think we should immediately begin work to ultimate achievement of metropolitan government. We should break the project into a series of attainable steps--i.e., a bite at a time. Much documentation of advantages would be required. And a realistic time table must be devised. It should be recognized that unification would be totally unpopular at first. The "step at a time" approach is the only way to proceed. (Questionnaire #02211)

Metropolitanism through initial integration of certain services (fire, police, etc., as suggested above), is, of course, one of the step-wise mechanisms. Similarly, several leaders feel that it should be possible now to bring together several interested municipalities, (not necessarily all at once) if some were proven to be interested, and begin explorations toward metropolitanism which at first need not encompass all the autonomous units of our areas. Indeed, bringing together interested community officials and citizens may be an adequate first step (one leader of Religious Social Service Programs voices this explicitly).

Repeatedly, the need for courageous political leadership to spearhead a movement in the desirable direction is being stressed by the leaders. One of the respondents (leader in the communications media of the community) feels that a referendum ought to be offered to the area citizens to voice their views on the issue.

Finally, one of the leaders chose to single out the Metropolitan Government issue to comment on because he feels that it better be left alone. A leader in Anti-Poverty Programs, he explains that the City's minorities have had a hard time as it is, and he does not feel that the kind of leadership which would emerge in a metropolitan complex might be exactly the people who would make life for minority group Americans even more difficult.

To be sure, among the Anti-Poverty Program leaders--more than in any other group--the opinions as to desirability of metropolitan government _tend to be split_, probably for the reasons indicated by the respondent referred to above. Thus, it would seem clear that steps in the direction of metropolitanism would have to include a very careful analysis of the probable effects on Pittsburgh's poorer and minority group citizens, and on programs designed to help them.

However, the kinds of things that should _not_ be done include the following--each mentioned by at least several of the leaders:

1. Local political leaders should _not_ be involved in the development of metropolitan governance, in fact, "the politicians with their self-interests" should be avoided.

2. The effort should definitely _not_ be initiated, and promulgated, by one political party only; bipartisanship is essential from the outset.

3. Political processes within municipalities, local boundaries, and opportunities for citizen identification with his community, should not be disrupted in the process.

4. No separate municipal administration for Pittsburgh should result.

5. No municipality in the County should be left out or, indeed, should be permitted to remain out.

6. The City of Pittsburgh should not be seen as the prime mover behind the process.

7. A referendum should be avoided.

8. Haste is to be avoided but deliberate speed is indicated.

9. We need to stop sitting on our hands and waiting for "someone else" to start the process.

> A frontal assault, loudly advocating metropolitan government, is not the answer. This will stiffen and organize resistance to progress. This action must come gradually, with the County taking over more functions that are too large and costly for individual municipalities to do themselves. (A leader in Housing and Urban Development, questionnaire #05745).

But the leaders are pessimistic about the five-year, and even longer, prospects. While they say what might be done, and what might be avoided, they expect that nothing much will actually happen. Not a single one is "optimistic" in a real sense, and a few expect minor steps (such as assembling of information, the possibility of consolidated purchasing, and gaining endorsements by a few supporting groups) as the best that seems to be hoped for.

Individually, the leaders do not tend to identify many groups or population segments as supportive of metropolitan governance. Quite a few even say that they "do not know of any" or that they "are not sure of any." But in the aggregate, the allies of metropolitan government seem many, and the listing becomes quite impressive.

The League of Women Voters, the Allegheny Conference, the Pennsylvania Economy League, the Regional Planning Association and the Urban League are among the more frequently mentioned supporters. But the list includes, if only occasionally, the universities and the academic community, some labor and business groups, the NAACP, the Criminal Justice Planning Board, police chiefs and policemen, some clergymen and a good portion of the social work community. The Federal Housing and Urban Development Department and the State Planning Board, too, are seen as backing the idea of metropolitan government. Many citizens are believed to be favorably disposed, and privately, not a few politicians.

The leaders are split on their perception of city and county officials--and city and county employees. Some place them among the supporters of metropolitan government, others, somewhat more frequently, among its opponents. In fact these are the only categories of individuals who appear on both the listing of supporters and of opponents.

The opposition is seen as resting mainly in the political parties (both Republican and Democratic) of Allegheny County, among the officials and employees of the many municipalities of the area, and among many citizens in the suburban belts around Pittsburgh.

On the whole, there is much more consensus among the leaders as to the groups and segments in opposition to metropolitanism than there is on potential supporters and allies.

The proper role of the institutions of higher learning, the universities, is seen predominantly in terms of the study and research on which an educational campaign would have to be based. But many leaders do not identify the universities as educating the public, with an emphasis on the county-wide dimensions of the problem, in a one-sided manner; rather, they feel that a fair presentation of advantages and disadvantages of metropolitanism would be most desirable. One leader only feels that the universities should become the plan's advocates, and another one believes that the universities must take a "pro" or "con" stand on the issue.

3. NEW BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY

Though the desirability of inducing the growth of new business and industry in Pittsburgh and the immediate environs is patent, this, too, is seen quite unlikely to happen in the coming years. Fifteen leaders chose to reflect on this issue specifically--and several others stressed changes in the tax climate as an essential precondition, commenting on that particular issue with reference to the need for new business and industry.

Indeed, most of the respondents are in strong agreement on the necessity for improving the tax structure, especially as it pertains to business. Whether they selected to discuss the "new business" item as such or the "tax climate" item, the two are seen inextricably linked to each other. Repeatedly, the need for concerted and planned effort on the part of business, labor, politics and planned effort on the part of business, labor, politics and education is stressed. Such effort is needed to improve the "labor, tax and cultural" aspects of community life as well as to help "sell Pittsburgh" (as a good place to work and live) to the nation's businessmen and industrialists.

Typical of the central pattern of thinking are the following remarks coming from a leader in Health Administration:

> Improve our labor market pool by attempting to reverse the emigration trend of prime labor age groups; improve the labor-management relations that have plagued the community, retrain basic industry workers for use in newer services and/or research type industries.
>
> Undertake more active program of site evaluation and solicitation of prospective industries, with special emphasis on, and incentives to, "industries of the future."
>
> Establish a more favorable financial climate with regard to taxes, interest in loans for new businesses, industrial development sites, etc. Continue expansion and broaden availability of cultural and educational facilities. (Questionnaire #04032)

And an industrialist voices the same ideas somewhat differently:

> Pittsburgh needs further diversification of industry and business. A climate conducive to attracting industry to the city should be established. Favorable taxes, pollution regulations, cultural and recreational facilities are among the factors which attract industry to a community.
>
> At the same time, the state in which the city is located needs to provide similar inducements to attract industry. Recent tax action at the state government level deals a serious blow to the tax inducement that heretofore prevailed. (Questionnaire #01711).

There is not much that the leaders say should not be done except for emphasizing that additional taxes should not be considered, and that almost any little bit of action will be of some help. Action is seen as lacking in imagination and leadership, of the R. K. Mellon, D. L. Lawrence or Arthur Van-Kirk type, as one of them puts it explicitly. Only one other cautionary item appears in several of the responses: the counterproductive effects of political feuding at the level of local government. As is the case with the metropolitan government issue, the leaders do not expect much in the way of desirable change over the next five-year period. The business and banking community is seen as nearly unanimous in favor of efforts in these directions. The leaders also specifically single out, in good numbers, the Regional Industrial Development Corporation (though one of them questions whether its present structure is optimal for getting things done), the Allegheny Conference, the Chamber of Commerce, the universities. They agree that both city and county officials are favorably disposed. In only one segment of the community is there disagreement: some of the leaders feel that labor organizations are supportive, whereas fewer others think that labor may well rank among the opponents. What is particularly important in this regard is the following: while "opposition" to metropolitan government was seen as fairly well crystallized and rather formidable, there are hardly any, except for those few who note segments of labor, who mention counterpressures when it comes to the idea of bringing in new business and industry.

Again, the universities are seen as mainly disseminators of facts, based on proper research, about such issues as the actual effects of taxes, patterns of labor migration, and the like. Sound analyses of "barriers to business growth here" are recommended (for instance, questionnaire #01811, a response of a leader industrialist). Working with business and industry and local municipalities "to develop or expand research centers to attract business through availability of increased community-wide technological resources" is suggested, along with participation in community-wide "manpower development programs with the development of programs at all levels including vocational colleges." (Questionnaire #04032, quotations from a leader in Health and Welfare). The universities, too, should come up with "imaginative proposals," including those for legislation (Questionnaire #01002, a leader in Government and the Law), and help in the formulation of an "economic plan which can point the way." (Questionnaire #07357, a leader in Anti-Poverty Programs.)

4. PUBLIC SCHOOL REFORM

Three questionnaire issues deal with the public school system: reforms of curricula and programs, the possible reorganization of the Board of Education, and the "Voucher" notion which would allow financial credit for parents so that they can choose between private and public schools without the duplicate financial burden that currently results. We know already that reforms of programs and curricula are seen as quite desirable, important, and somewhat likely. Reorganization of the Board of Education is among the less desired options, as it is both unimportant and not very likely at all.

The "Voucher" concept is one of the two issues yielding over-all negative desirability, in effect, some undesirability; it is unimportant and also, unlikely.

Fifteen leaders chose to specifically discuss the need for program and curricular reforms, three were concerned over the "Voucher" notion (one of whom was in strong opposition), and two specifically commented on reorganization of the Board of Education (one was entirely opposed to the notion of an elective Board and the other, equally strongly, in favor).

However, the need for reconsidering the Board of Education was mentioned by several leaders in their suggestions regarding school programs and curricula: thus the issues tend to be intertwined, and it seems appropriate to deal with all three items at this time.

The more general suggestions bearing upon school programs and curricula can be summed up as follows:

1. More flexible curricula designed in light of individual student needs.

2. More willingness to, and actuality of, experimentation (with new courses, new approaches).

3. The possibility of faculty and student exchanges among district schools.

4. Greater emphasis on vocational education, including the setting up of appropriate vocational schools.

5. New, and more demanding, standards for the selection of faculty members for the public school system.

6. Reorganization of the Board of Education: by making membership elective (this idea also is strongly opposed by a few of the leaders), by decentralization, yielding greater neighborhood control and involvement (this idea, too, being opposed by a few).

7. Floating, rather than static, programs not confined only to a given school building and to precise time periods (such as 9 AM to 4PM only).

Quite a few leaders agree that we should not continue as we have thus far. Some remark that students ought not be left out of the process of deliberation regarding any reforms. Professional educators, who "have a vested interest in the continuation of the present system" (Questionnaire #01002) should not dominate the process of planning for reforms.

The "Voucher" system ought to be introduced (two leaders feel this way), but we should not allow "its introduction without integration safeguards" (Questionnaire #08364, from a leader in Interdenominational Religious Social Service Programs.)

Again, the leaders are not sanguine about the coming five years: some expect a few minor changes, many think further deterioration (including that of the physical plants and facilities) is likely due to worsening financial conditions, and some sense too much resistance among the public school educators and the administrators against the needed changes.

Many students, many parents (and parent groups), a few teachers, a few members of the Education Board are seen as supportive of program reforms. Leaders of universities and colleges, "innovators in schools of education" and Pittsburgh's religious leaders are also viewed in this light. The U.S. Office of Education and the various state committees are cited among the protagonists of reforms.

In turn, the Board of Education, teachers' unions, and some trade and labor organizations are believed to be not impressed by the need for changes.

As to the desirability of reorganizing the Board of Education itself, perhaps instrumental (as seen by several leaders) to other reforms in programs and curricula, all black organizations (one leader's answer pitted them against all white organizations), the NAACP, the Urban League, Citizens Concerned About Schools tend to be defined as favoring such measures, whereas the Board itself (and some teachers) are viewed as entirely opposed.

A prominent religious (Protestant) leader comments on the role of the universities:

> You produce almost all those teachers and many of the administrators. The problem of deadening classrooms, and out-of-date subject matter and boredom and schools-as-baby-sitters is very much your creation. PUT MORE MONEY INTO TEACHER-TRAINING!! GET OUT INTO THE SCHOOLS! STOP VALUING DE-HUMANIZED SPECIALIZATION AT THE EXPENSE OF CHILDREN. (Questionnaire #08462: the emphasis, capitalization and exclamation marks are the leader's and not the author's emphasis.)

The institutions of higher learning should, in turn, do such things as the following:

1. Support students in their demands for change in public school system.

2. Make accreditation of teachers more stringent than it has been--"graduate professionals in the fullest sense of the word" (Questionnaire #04331--a leader in Health and Welfare), and generally, look at the whole process of teacher education.

3. Act as resources for Board of Education and school administrations, and generally, as a clearinghouse of educational innovation.

4. Plan a new model for consideration by the Pittsburgh community.

5. Promote cooperative relations with public schools in the area to help with curriculum development (as well as continued teacher training).

In addition to these ideas, several leaders stress the role of the universities in not merely conducting their own research into these specific practical problems, but also in disseminating information on relevant experiences elsewhere. The need for teacher training which is sensitized to the needs of Black children, in particular, tends to be stressed by some of the leaders.

5. RAPID TRANSIT

There is consensus on desirability and importance of some kind of a rapid transit system for Pittsburgh and environs. Relative to its desirability, the actualization of a system in the five-year period is seen as rather less likely, though the overall likelihood is exceeded only by ten other items on the roster of futures.

There is near complete consensus among the thirteen leaders who singled out rapid transit for more detailed discussion that the time has come to begin construction, to begin implementing some plan rather than to continue "studies" or "discussions"-- which many identify as the kinds of things not to do.

Only one leader singles out the Skybus project as something that ought to be begun immediately; another one advocates immediate steps toward utilization of existing rails (similar to WABCO proposal).

> Start building a cheap (subsidized) rapid transit system to open up greater Pittsburgh area to more even development. Rapid transit within the City is as important as that connecting the suburbs to the City: it should make Pittsburgh negotiable for the poor. (Questionnaire #08462 from a leader of Religious Social Service Programs.)

What is needed, indeed, is "a final and firm decision by county government as to which is the best system for our community. Then, immediate implementation of adopted plan." (Questionnaire #04132).

Immediately, the Pittsburgh Transit Authority ought to lease or buy PRR right of way and put rapid transit in (Budd cars or equivalent), emphasizes another leader (Questionnaire #01405, a leader in Government and Law).

Several leaders tie the need for immediate measures to problems of automotive traffic congestion and its contribution to the pollution problem.

If continuing discussions and even comparative or other research studies do not fare well with the leaders, the main theme which runs through the question on what should be avoided has to do with "political bickering," "political infighting" and the overall "politization" of the issue as a whole. The overall points are well summarized in the two quotations which follow:

> We should not settle for a system that does only part of the job and should not bicker about the merits and costs of various plans to the point that we deny ourselves any form of real rapid transit. (Questionnaire #04834).

And,

> Such a system must not be an inflexible Great Wall, dividing communities from one another; it must not be a political bottomless pit, ruined by political, industry and union graft; it must not serve only the well-to-do suburbanites. (Questionnaire #08462.)

Limited progress, but progress nonetheless, tends to be anticipated over the five-year period. Most leaders think that beginnings of a rapid transit system are, in fact, on the horizon, but a great deal of change in the desired direction is not expected. A few of the leaders do not expect anything beyond further debates and, perhaps, studies of alternatives.

Of course, these expectations are antecedent to the recent award of federal funds, and we would not be surprised to find the leaders now projecting more progress than they had in the Spring of 1971, though not necessarily toward the kinds of systems which many would like to see. Yet, some of the real difficulties can be surmised by considering the patterns of perceived support and opposition. Depending on the kind of system, implied, or occasionally made explicit, such agencies as the Port Authority, Chamber of Commerce, the "highway interests," or the "steel-wheel" interests are placed into the camps of protagonists and antagonists.

Thus, although many leaders commented on the undesirability of the politization of the whole issue, and on the undue delays this occasions in any development process, the data on groups and organizations in agreement, and disagreement, with their own position suggest that they perceive a genuine intra-community split over the choice of system(s), and the cleavage is not merely political.

As has been the case with other issues already discussed, the universities could best serve the community by providing the kind of objective information baseline, via study, on which viable community decisions could be made. But several of the leaders also feel that the universities actually ought to stay out of the controversies surrounding the rapid transit concepts altogether.

6. POLLUTION CONTROL

All in all, thirteen community leaders chose the need for pollution control devices as an item on which to present more details; eleven, in turn, dealt with anti-pollution legislation; and two emphasized the need for control over automobile traffic, especially in Pittsburgh's downtown, both in terms of the traffic congestion problem as such and in terms of the drive against pollutants.

Both the "devices" and "laws" items turned out among the most desired, most important--and also most likely options. Regulation of car traffic, too, was seen as quite desirable, rather important, with about fifty-fifty chances over the five-year period.

What needs to be done, of course, is to encourage R & D in the area of anti-pollution technology. On this, indeed, the leaders are in agreement, but this is a measure with a payoff in an uncertain (though not necessarily remote) future.

In more immediate terms, the leaders are suggesting the need for tax incentives to business and industry for the installation of already existing control devices and systems. Cutbacks in automotive traffic (private cars, trucks, busses) are advocated by several of them--in addition to the two leaders who deal with car traffic regulation as a separate issue.

And finally, one of the leaders, a religious leader, feels that we may have to be willing to accept some lowering of standards of living, to embrace a simpler--less consumption oriented--way of life, as a precondition toward a meaningful solution.

On anti-pollution laws, the leaders favor stricter enforcement of already existing regulations; and several of them call for stiffer penalties against violators. Uniform state laws and standards, as well as federal laws and especially standards are also seen as badly needed to make inroads against the problem.

> The laws must be enforced. Neither the county nor the state legislature is allocating the necessary funds or the personnel.
>
> Rally downtown on County Air Enforcement--factual speeches; deputation to County Health Department, County Solicitor, County Commissioners.
>
> Water: rally in Harrisburg--factual speeches; deputatior to Governor, President of the Senate, Speaker of the House, Secretary of the Department of Environmental Resources.
>
> Citizens groups to learn simple matters: how to read a Ringemann chart, how to sample water for testing. Universities to change curricula and accreditation so that enforcing agencies will get direct (graduate student) help in terms of bodies.
>
> Pressure industry to accelerate rate of investment in pollution abatement equipment. (Questionnaire #08971, a leader in Environment Control.)

A different, though certainly not incompatible, view is presented cogently by a religious leader:

> The critical nature of the problem demands action. There is evidence that a number of industries have been and are working to correct the situation. Considerable money has been invested in anti-pollution devices. The recent anti-pollution ordinance is of some help. In some situations the fact is that the necessary technology has not been developed to provide the devices or processes needed to eliminate some forms of air and water pollution. This necessitates further research, pooling of funds, public and private, for research and development. A coalition of effort of public agencies and business and industry, something like the effort which brought about the Pittsburgh Renaissance. (Questionnaire #08565.)

By far most of the leaders do not mention anything that should be avoided in seeking a solution. A few who advocate stricter law enforcement and stiffer penalties right now feel that the "polluters should not get away with it"; indeed, some feel that "good laws will end the problem."

In more specific terms: no more conferences and meetings about pollution problems, but actions toward solution; no more parking lots, and no more and/or wider roads through, into and around downtown.

But cautionary remarks about seemingly easy approaches are also in evidence, perhaps best typified by the following:

> Restrictive, unrealistic regulations should be avoided if inconsistent with technological development, time and cost factors. Meeting such regulations could result in the shutdown of facilities with resultant unemployment. (Questionnaire #01911, an industrialist.)

Several leaders expect steady, and meaningful, progress due to successes of the R & D effort. Some expect a measure of progress because they feel that federal standards, and some state standards, might well be adopted in the coming five-year period.

A few, in turn, are more pessimistic: some feel that new national issues are likely to emerge to divert attention and funds from concerns with ecology; and some feel simply that nothing beyond today's measures is in the cards through 1975.

On this issue, many leaders see a bulk of the citizenry (supportive) pitted against industry (opposed) and, occasionally, against labor organizations. This is particularly true about programs involving legal regulation, strict enforcement, and major penalties for noncompliance. Those who feel that tax incentives for industry would be desirable to help share the burden of installing pollution control systems tend to see, in turn, most of the industry in agreement with their viewpoint, and some citizen groups and some labor organizations opposed because they would construe such steps as giving industry special, and unwarranted, privileges.

The universities should "exert influence toward a better understanding by the citizenry of the problems involved in controlling pollution." (Questionnaire #01911.) They should "provide every means of communication from the technical to the lay public," and "persuade the press to be less negative and assess the difficulties with equal weight to the potential progress." (Questionnaire #10371.)

> As in the other cases, I believe that the role of the University is to research the next stage and implications of community change. In the case of pollution control, economic viewpoint is the key phrase. We must learn to accept the cost of pollution control in the cost of manufacture and in all goods. (Questionnaire #08771.)

Apart from the research role of the universities, some action roles emerge as well. Characteristic is the following comment:

> Much of the impetus behind this district's present recycling problems has been generated by University of Pittsburgh personnel, though acting in private capacities. With the full influence and resources of the University behind them, such small but growing efforts would expand much more rapidly. (Questionnaire #09281, a leader in the community's media of communication.)

7. CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM

Very desirable, important, and fairly likely--these are succinct characterizations of the notion that the community's criminal justice system may call for major reforms. A leader, himself in the Judiciary, puts some of the main points in this manner:

> Complete overhaul of the prison system. Reduction of many offenses from felonies to misdemeanors and misdemeanors to summary offenses. Treatment of alcoholism (and several leaders would add: and drug addiction--our note) as an illness rather than a crime. Establishment of community treatment centers for adult and juvenile offenders. Limitations on 'frivolous' appeals. (Questionnaire #00902.)

This is quite in keeping with many of the other comments. Other major suggestions can be summarized rather easily:

1. Complete further overhaul of the bail system.
2. An adequate public defender system.
3. Reorganization of the courts.
4. Elimination of the backlog of cases.

5. Rehabilitative rather than punitive justice.
6. Standardization of penalties and sentences for similar crimes and circumstances.

Perhaps another quotation, one from a (Roman Catholic) religious leader can shed additional light on the mainstream of the thinking of the various leaders:

> Pennsylvania Penal Code should be revised. Maximum sentences on certain offenses should be lowered bringing the law in line with sentencing practices; bail bond maximum equal maximum fine allowed by law; elimination of summary proceedings; require magistrates to keep standardized records of proceedings and certain information on offenders; set guidelines for assessing fines; establishment of community services for the offender population--group therapy, medical diagnosis, family counselling, halfway houses, work-study release programs. Guidelines and standards should be set for appropriate treatment of offenders and services to be rendered by probation departments, and for qualifications for personnel. (Questionnaire #08161.)

Another leader (Health and Welfare) recommends that "the courts should be relieved of the burden of litigation over automobile accidents by the plan whereby each insurance company meets the cost of the insured's damage, regardless of who is at fault." (Questionnaire #04531.) Along with many others, this study participant also advocates a "more realistic appraisal of the number of courts necessary to adjudicate justice" in order to expedite trials, "assuring speedy punishment of the guilty and exonoration of the innocent."

There is hardly anything the leaders identify as unwanted steps toward reforms. In fact, insofar as any responses are given at all, they simply say that the only thing not to do is "to continue" with the present system. One cautionary note is sounded by a leader in Religious Social Service Programs who recommends numerous reforms, particularly stressing the rights of the uneducated and the poor, the need for rehabilitation rather than punishment, and the need for community's receptivity, via employment opportunities, to the offender who has paid his debt to society. But he cautions against

> . . . complete abdication of 'justice' as a means of placating social groups. Society should and must be fair but it must not be abused in the name of progress. (Questionnaire #07664.)

"Do not meet crime on streets type problems with more punishment," advises another study participant (Questionnaire #07562, also a religious leader), a point with which most of the leaders are in agreement inasmuch as it is implied in many of their more specific recommendations. Some improvements are expected, but radical changes are not. On the whole, the leaders are somewhat more optimistic about the prospects regarding this issue than has been the case with the other items already discussed. The ACLU, the NAACP, many civic groups, many judges are seen as favoring reforms in the indicated directions. Only four leaders identify any groups which might take a different view of the matter: the Fraternal Order of Police (which all four mention), and the bail bondsmen (which two of them specifically cite).

Other than conducting research to evaluate alternative programs of reform, the universities can provide a forum for the discussion of the issues, seminars and institutes on problems of offenders and of criminal justice administration, enlighten students of law as well as the general public on the "plight of the underprivileged as well as on the desperate situation within the walls of the penal institutions" (the latter point from questionnaire #07664). Perhaps, the universities also might consider developing special educational courses for prison inmates (same leader as in the above).

8. THE WELFARE SYSTEM

Twelve of the leaders address the problem of reforms in the public welfare system. Two participants are concerned with the private sector. And one leader singles out the issue of "welfare recipient political power."

Reforms of public welfare programs and agencies are among the most desired changes in our community; they also are seen as very important, and in the quantitative index terms, very likely.

In turn, changes in private welfare programs are less wanted, less important, and substantially less likely. And finally, the emergence of welfare recipients as a political power is among the least wanted and least important items on the community agenda, with odds of about fifty-fifty that such developments may come to pass by 1975.

Perhaps it is best to begin the analysis with the "political power of recipients" issue since only one leader specifically commented on it. But his points are such as to permit us to set the tone to the remainder of the discussion.

What should be done?

> Since this government has been tragically negligent of facing up to the ever mounting problem of those citizens who are welfare recipients, and since an unstable economy has caused their ranks to constantly increase, these needy citizens should seek dignity by taking their destinies into their own hands and seek political organization. Thus they could wield a meaningful clout in redressing the wrongs of society. (Questionnaire #04231, a Health and Welfare leader.)

And what should be avoided, given such political thrust on the part of the recipients?

> I feel that once they achieve political organization they should not attempt to exercise power selfishly--but work with other progressive, well meaning and democratic organizations dedicated to meaningful social changes which would bring benefits to all members of society. (Same leader as above.)

This study participant expects progress in the direction indicated. He sees many groups (Welfare Rights groups, the ACLU, the ADA, the Urban League, NAACP, the Lawyers Guild, the New Left, Common Cause and "other progressive and liberal organizations") as endorsing a similar position; on the other hand, both political parties, craft unions, and various specific "conservative organizations (John Birch Society, American Legion, D.A.R., National Manufacturers' Association)" as the opposition. (The terms in quotation marks appear specifically in the response, and organizations cited are specifically listed.) In other words--and this is the reason for dwelling on this particular leader's views, even though he may have been the only one to express it--a modicum of non-abused political power is seen as prerequisite, or instrumental, to the needed reforms in the welfare system. This respondent's viewpoint also helps to outline the main line of controversy: an emphasis on the programs catering to the needs of the recipients and maintaining (if not restoring) their dignity as human beings by "adequate measures," versus the need for some kind of streamlining of the programs to separate those who really need help from those who merely abuse the system such as it may be.

> The concept of welfare should be redefined to eliminate outright waste and to end programs which do little more than stifle individual initiative and responsibility. Making welfare more efficient should reduce its cost which is rapidly becoming disproportionate. (Questionnaire #02211)

This is a viewpoint quite different from the one which we have chosen to quote next:

> The system must become more responsive to recipients as individuals and as humans. More concern needed for people as opposed to concern over procedures. (Questionnaire #07862, a religious leader.)

And, in a sense, the following would seem to be a position between the two previous ones:

> System should be revised so that all persons entitled to aid should have no difficulty getting it, and all persons who are employable, and for whom jobs are available, should be stricken from the rolls.
>
> Regardless of the political consequences this may entail, it would at least do one thing--allow the state, without

> additional funds, to increase the grants to the deserving to a more livable standard. (Questionnaire #06354, a leader in Anti-Poverty Programs.)

More specific suggestions are also occasionally made:

1. "Take politics out of the administration of the agencies--have qualified people trained in social science and paid a decent salary man the various offices." (Questionnaire #08871, a leader in Environment Control efforts.)

2. The federal government should take over the total cost and administration of welfare programs resulting in greater national uniformity in benefits which would possibly check migration of the deprived to the urban ghettoes of states now offering the fullest welfare benefits. (Questionnaire #07281, a mass media leader.)

3. More public funds should be channeled into private welfare organizations. (Questionnaire #05034, a leader in Health and Welfare.)

4. Government guaranteed income program is needed.

5. Low income persons should have a voice in all programs affecting them--a voice on the appropriate Boards of Directors and the like. (Both previous points from a religious leader, questionnaire #08364.)

Here is another idea, taken verbatim from the response of one of the Anti-Poverty Program leaders:

> Federal, state and private money should be used to finance demonstration projects for the efficient delivery of welfare services. The projects should highlight the goal of the welfare program rather than the delivery system. What I mean to say is that there are more humanistic yet efficient ways of delivering welfare services when the idealistic result of the program is held as paramount rather than the preservation of a traditional system. New approaches successfully performed on a demonstration basis should receive the support necessary to supplant the present processes used by traditional welfare agencies, whether

> they use tax funds or public donations, such as, United Fund appeals. (Questionnaire #06657).

The same leader also continues:

> Since the goal of a welfare program can be achieved in various ways, it might be more advisable to develop a welfare system composed of several successfully proven demonstration projects. Thus one would be more apt to suit the system to the recipient rather than the recipient to the system.

What then are some of the things to be avoided? We should not depend on "federal, state and existing planning groups to bring an organized plan out of chaos" (questionnaire #07357, an Anti-Poverty Program leader).

In direct opposition to the one leader who emphasized the need, borne out of the situation, for the development of political power among the recipients, is the following cogent statement:

> Institutionalizing and politically structuring public welfare recipients, as your Article 17 (this being the issue of recipient political power appearing under that number in the questionnaire; author's note), would be socially disastrous. It is not the intent of these words to suggest political disenfranchisement of the poor. But to create a political bloc of individuals whose principal common premise is deprivation would invite political demagoguery and manipulation at its worst. (Questionnaire #09281, a media leader.)

And, another viewpoint:

> There should be no further embellishment of the idea that people--by the fact of their mere existence--are entitled to complete public support of every need. We can't abandon those who are in need but who can't provide for themselves. But we must eliminate the free-loaders or be buried under the costs of welfare. (Questionnaire #02211, an industrialist.)

The leaders are split over the issue regarding the expected five-year progress: some expected the needed changes, and in fact, quite a few do; some feel that the federal government will, indeed, take over the nation-wide administration of the programs; and some feel that not much will happen "until the issue is forced," and that such force "will ultimately develop as the costs of welfare mount."

And again: if there is pessimism regarding attempts at viable reforms, it has to do with the notion that political considerations, and sensitivities, on the part of elective office holders (certainly not merely local ones) will prevent any major, and needed, overhaul.

The leaders disagree as to who is in favor of, or in opposition to, various reforms. The disagreement is patterned depending on whether the needed program components involve "cost and efficiency" factors, however (without disregard for the human problems involved), or "human dignity" or "need" (largely, with disregard for the cost factors).

If there is an agreement among the leaders, it is, perhaps sadly, this: the political parties as they are organized are a likely impediment to progress. Of course, those who feel that a more demanding test of need might be called for (i.e., real unemployability and the like) believe that such groups as the Chamber of Commerce, the Allegheny Conference, the National Alliance of Businessmen, and possibly, the National Industrial Conference Board might advocate a similar position. In turn, these leaders also believe that such groups as the League of Welfare Recipients, "social scientists on campus and in government," might be in opposition. In turn, those who believe in expanding the welfare efforts or those who do not subscribe to any curtailing (including, by implication, that of people who could get jobs) stress the support of various civic groups, and once again, the opposition of "conservatives."

The battle lines on this issue clearly pit the "progressives" against the "conservatives" wherever they may be located in the community, but this does not seem to contribute significant ideas as to what needs to be done one way or another.

An Anti-Poverty Program leader is not alone in being disturbed by the role of the universities. But his wording might well be used as somewhat representative:

> I feel that the universities have contributed to the current problem by their disciplinary approach which tends to espouse a fragmentary doctrine. If the trainers don't understand a universal well-coordinated welfare system, how can their products (trainees) be any better. (Questionnaire #07357, an Anti-Poverty Program leader.)

9. NEW REVENUE SOURCES

This, too, is a desirable outcome. It is important, and some solutions (in the quantitative index terms) are somewhat more likely than not. Twelve leaders reflected on the matter, but it is, in a significant sense, tied also to the emergence of metropolitan government, or at least, the merging of city and county governance.

Education of the public and studies of various forms of taxation are among the proposals offered. There are also voices to do away with real estate tax exemptions used by religious, charitable, educational--and perhaps governmental--agencies. (Questionnaire #04834 illustrates this point most forcefully.)

A somewhat different point is elaborated upon by one of the community's leading industrialists:

> Reduction in heavy reliance on real estate taxes for producing revenue for city government. County and city financing should be merged to spread the costs more broadly. County will have to assume more of the city's costs. The federal government through tax sharing will have to return on an untied basis more revenue to the city (Questionnaire #01811).

And again,

> 1. Congressional approval of a General Revenue Sharing Plan, enabling mayors and local governments to expend federal revenues on the basis of local need. Elimination of categorical grants with increase in total number of dollars coming into the city.
>
> 2. Assistance from private foundations and agencies to the cities in sharing costs.

3. Greater financial assistance from Allegheny County. (Questionnaire #00101, a Government leader.)

Another leader (Government and Law) feels strongly that "home rule for the city with power to tax non-residents on income derived from employment or business conducted in the city" (Questionnaire #01405) is needed. Others emphasize the need for public education, high level inquiries (via study commission) into the city's problems and into solutions to these problems.

Piecemeal approaches are to be shied away from; further taxation is not seen as the answer by some (although, as we have seen, other leaders feel that some of the tax exempt real estate properties should really be subject to taxing); increases in non-vital (and patronage) services should be avoided (though the leader, in education, questionnaire #03422, does not identify these non-vital or patronage services further).

The idea of revenue shared with the federal government yields somewhat different warnings:

> . . . although a fair share of the revenue generated by the cities should be returned to them by the federal government, the government should supervise and control the disbursement of the funds where the needs are indicated and not the city government. This is necessary to promote a fair and impartial use of the funds and not embroil them into pork-barrel, partisan and inefficient schemes of local patronage and power struggles. (Questionnaire #04231.)

But also:

> If added revenues are allocated, there should not be rigid guidelines and 'red tape' connected to the expenditure of these funds. (Questionnaire #00101.)

In the above, the reference also is to "added revenues" via tax sharing. Some form of tax sharing, in fact, is seen as extremely likely, if not inevitable. Other leaders think that tax exempt properties will not come to be taxed, but some kind of compromise might result--a system of "payment for services based on a formula reflecting police and fire protection and other services received." (Questionnaire #04834.)

Some progress is therefore expected but, once again, perhaps not enough to bring about the desired situation. County commissioners and many suburban communities (and suburbanites) are believed opposed to greater county contributions to the city treasury. In turn, the City Council, the Pennsylvania Economy League, the League of Women Voters are defined as supporters.

As far as programs to tax religious, charitable and educational institutions and agencies, the "affected agencies" are seen as major opponents, while no particular groups seem to have rallied in support of such an effort.

Again, political parties in our area are believed to oppose not tax sharing as such, but to oppose tax sharing under continued federal control and scrutiny.

Again, the universities are to study alternatives and recommend solutions; they should support action leading to tax sharing at the federal level; they might consider accepting their own financial obligations and initiating discussions regarding tax exemptions with other potentially affected institutions. Indeed, since the "universities are in a financial crisis themselves, they should organize a lobby for federally controlled and disbursed funds." (Questionnaire #04331)

10. HEALTH SERVICES

Improvements in health delivery, as well as new ideas in payment for health services, are among the most salient community issues in terms of the quantitative measures of desirability, importance, and likelihood. This would suggest both that steps in this direction are wanted and that they are also rather likely to happen in the coming five-year period.

A viewpoint of one of the leaders in Health and Welfare represents the common theme among the study participants rather well:

> 1. Expansion of ambulatory care facilities for acute and chronic illness.
>
> 2. Development of extended care facilities, nursing homes, etc., on a not-for-profit operating basis.
>
> 3. Develop alternate forms of health care delivery systems through health maintenance organizations, group practice capitation experiments, neighborhood clinics, home care programs, and the like.
>
> 4. Develop a fully integrated facilities and services planning system with predetermination of total community needs. (Questionnaire #04032.)

The "non-profit" emphasis with respect to delivery systems repeatedly runs through the suggestions as the single most important thread. The need to lower existing costs by coordinated total-community planning of health services is similarly stressed. Several leaders speak of further steps toward "socialized medicine," not always under that name, but occasionally, specifically using such terminology. The planning need involves, among others, the necessity to "identify a feasible geographic community within the various neighborhoods which would serve as a base for the organization of required services." (Questionnaire #05954, a Black Community Program leader.) Duplication of services should be eliminated with the resultant overall cost lowering. (Questionnaire #08264, a religious leader.)

> Establishment of family health care facilities providing total medical out-patient and diagnostic services under one roof, separate from emergency facilities, under a pre-paid plan. Better use of para-professionals--development of a Master's in-medicine program, for example. (Questionnaire #10499.)

And also,

> Citizens should be made aware of, and informed about, the health care services available. Detoxification, drug abuse, mental health, job placement and training centers should be established

> and made available to all citizens who need such services. Too, relief should be given to the poor and if the needy and the aged people with fixed and limited incomes so that they can get medicare and other health care services they need. (Questionnaire #08161.)

The cautions include "hasty, ill-considered action to meet demands and not real needs" (Questionnaire #01811), the danger of programs which lead to "difference in the quality of health services dispersed to the rich and the poor" (Questionnaire #09782), and the lack of urgency to create new "human services units to help alleviate the problem," because the "problem is money, and if persons in need had the money they would find the services needed." (Questionnaire #04735.)

This is somewhat different, in emphasis, to a point which we have chosen to quote in full:

> 1. We should not allow continued uncontrolled growth of individual facilities and services without regard to total community needs determined by a master plan.
>
> 2. Should not promote or accept complete government control of health care services and facilities.
>
> 3. Should not enact any massive national health care program until and/or unless adequate facilities, services and personnel are available to render needed service. (Questionnaire #04032.)

In this problem area, fairly significant progress is expected by a number of the leaders; many health insurance programs are likely to be introduced both by the state and federal governments; fine leadership in the program planning area has been emerging and thus important payoffs can be hoped for; the problems are too acute to be ignored at the national (and state) levels. But some leaders also are pessimistic in not expecting anything to happen, or even, expecting unwanted steps to be realized--but this view is more pronounced among those few leaders who are not in favor of nation-wide health care programs.

A program to provide enough money for the needy citizens to cover such things as visits to doctors offices and adequate funds for necessary hospital stay is seen favored by various Welfare Rights Organizations, the Mayor's Commission on Human Resources, the NAACP and many others--but opposed by the federal government and the state legislature.

The American Medical Association is believed antagonistic to many needed reforms, as are hospital administrators, and various health-related profit making organizations. Those who feel that better planning, avoidance of duplicate services, increased quality of services but at lower cost are desirable appear to include many citizens, as well as many individuals "now associated with Hospital Planning Association"--while some doctors and local hospital boards might not be as favorably disposed.

The universities might consider doing such things as:

1. Developing a Master's of Medicine program.

2. Providing special financial assistance to doctoral students who are willing to work, upon completion of their studies, as volunteers or interns on needed low-cost public health programs.

3. "Work in cooperation with community planning agencies in assessment of short-term and long-term health manpower needs; and assist in development of coordinated educational programs which will assure well-trained personnel in sufficient numbers to meet predetermined needs."

4. "Assume leadership role in development of meaningful data on relationship of environmental factors to community health and in establishment of educational programs designed to create greater public awareness of individual and corporate responsibilities in improving health standards." (The last two points, questionnaire #04032.)

11. THE BLACK COMMUNITY

Three items need to be specifically considered: further major advances in racial integration, an issue on which eight leaders chose to comment; emphasis on economic development of Pittsburgh's Blacks, on which five leaders wrote more extensively; and, political power development which four considered.

There is, perhaps, only one basic difference which runs through the recommendations regarding racial integration. Some leaders suggest specific steps; several others feel that actualization of concepts already in existence, via enforcement, might suffice.

A leader in Housing and Urban Development exemplifies the former category:

> Remove barriers impeding integration on a county or regional basis including affirmative action such as construction of new towns and suburbs.
>
> Provide municipal services in deprived areas comparable to standards acceptable elsewhere in the area.
>
> Void discriminatory zoning and land use regulations.
>
> Provide facilities in de facto segregated areas to enable inhabitants to attain upward mobility.
>
> Seek means to attract all citizens to certain functions in segregated areas. (Questionnaire #05344.)

Another leader, religious, makes a brief list:

> Much more low income housing in suburbs -
>
> integration of construction unions -
>
> integration of executive offices in Golden Triangle -
>
> integration of school systems, county-wide, public and private -
>
> integration of police force. (Questionnaire #08364.)

An Anti-Poverty Program leader has a somewhat different view, although he undoubtedly would not disagree with ideas such as those previously mentioned:

> Is there really need for new programs for integration? Or should there just be an overhauling of old ones? Look at our county government. There are over 20 departments and not one Black department head or deputy . . . (Questionnaire #07057: the response continues with the citing of particular political leaders in a highly negative context. Because we cannot directly provide them with an opportunity to explain, or qualify, we have not included the full statement.)

A Black Community Programs leader:

> No need for new programs being developed for racial relations. There are enough acceptable programs now. Why not implement these? (Questionnaire #06354.)

An educator proposes a thorough analysis to determine if real integration (emphasis his) can be achieved in the city and in the school board. If (emphasis his) it can be done regardless of the "steady movement of Whites to suburbs then it should be made known"--if it turned out impossible that also should be made clear to all concerned. (Questionnaire #03021.)

In considering Black economic development, the stress is placed on opening up all labor unions to Blacks, on more funds and expert advice, when called for, to develop Black business enterprises, and more direct and personal participation of White businessmen in aid of such a process. As might be expected, the ideas regarding Black political power somewhat divide the few leaders who dealt with the issue between those who propose to increase the political voice of the Blacks "within the system," and those who are looking for alternatives--because of the past failures of this very "system."

An educational leader suggests:

> 1. The educated Blacks have to become more involved in the political arena.

> 2. Major political parties have to seek better qualified Black candidates for office.
>
> 3. More emphasis put forth to educate the people of their political rights and to exercise them. (Questionnaire #03322.)

And another one simply states that "we need more Black politicians." (Questionnaire #03623.)

From a leader in Anti-Poverty efforts comes a statement more characteristic of the alternative viewpoint:

> The Black community has been sold down the river for many years. And now, during a time of crisis, the so-called Black leaders are continuing to sell their fellow men down the river. It is felt that it is high time that the Blacks should eliminate all the so-called do-gooders and organizations and try to unite under a solid front and select a person whom they feel is not out for personal gains and will not sell his soul for a few peanuts. Unite solidly--this is the answer. (Questionnaire #07057.)

This leader also explicitly denounces demagoguery--"it is sorrowful when a loud mouth can incite a few hungry people," and Blacks that know better should not condone this.

Another feels that things _not_ to do must include--for any "citizen Black or White who is really sincere about the integration problem"--_not_ voting for candidates "who think as bigots" (and a couple of names are suggested in the way of illustration in Questionnaire #07057).

A leader in Health and Welfare suggests:

> Try to subdue, or at least tone down, extreme militant approaches--particularly those which condone, advocate, or utilize physical violence and property damage. (Questionnaire #04132.)

This leader also makes recommendations as to some of the needed, if fairly general, steps:

> New laws; enforcement of existing laws; education of people regarding this issue; changes in business and industry; changes in school programs; and many others.
>
> More dynamic and articulate involvements by public officials and other community leaders.
>
> Much greater involvement and dynamic approach by church leaders of all faiths. (Questionnaire #04132 as above.)

On the racial front, improvements are generally expected. Only two of the leaders are pessimistic in this regard. Some, exemplified below, are quite specific as to the--admittedly limited--progress which can be anticipated:

> Federal programs planned to ease the path to full integration but no immediate implementation.
>
> Bussing of students from segregated areas--but limited cross-bussing.
>
> Legal action by interested agencies to break barriers to integration in specific, individual cases.
>
> Court actions voiding discriminatory zoning laws.
>
> Limited craft union integration. (Questionnaire #05344, Housing and Urban Development leader.)

"Some isolated break-throughs" are expected by a leader in Government and Law (Questionnaire #01405). Blacks are expected to get "absorbed, in the main, into White businesses and trained therein" (Questionnaire #02312, a business leader). The pattern of agreements and disagreements with the various viewpoints of the leaders is both clear and rather predictable: efforts toward integration, economic and political advancement of the Black community, are seen as favored by most Blacks, and opposed by many (moderate income, as some of the leaders put it) Whites. Very conservative organizations (John Birch Society, Ku Klux Klan are explicitly referred to) are opponents; the NAACP, many church organizations, all civil rights groups, the ADA are seen as supportive.

Craft unions are believed opposed to union integration, which in turn, such organizations as ADA, various federal agencies (Housing and Urban Development specifically mentioned), and ACLU support. On the other hand, "Black racist groups," and some "Black political groups competing for power" are believed not to favor the involvement of White businessmen in programs to help develop Black businesses, while the NAB appears to have been seen as mainly supportive.

On the issue of significant increases in political power, one leader pits all Black groups (supportive) against all White groups (antagonistic).

The universities need to continue and intensify their efforts, "educational within the university curriculum and extracurricular programs" and to participate in "various community efforts and projects designed to achieve this goal" (Questionnaire #04132--the reference is, of course, to "racial integration" as the goal).

The universities should "insist on integration at all levels of employment, use only integrated labor for construction, and assist, in no way, non-integrated schools or communities." (Questionnaire #08364). "Individuals trained in political science" should "devote some time in Black communities encouraging political involvement from all Blacks in the community, including involvement in churches, civic clubs and social clubs." (Questionnaire #03322.)

The universities thus can serve, in effect, by setting an example in their practices, by educational efforts both within the university and throughout the larger community, and by involvement in other programs (non-university initiated) which aim at improvements on the racial front.

12. HOUSING

New developments in low and middle income housing, including housing for the aged, were rated among the ten most wanted futures, an important issue, and one rather likely of progress in the five-year period.

> Assuming that our overall intent is to assure every family sanitary and adequate housing, the answer is not massive new 'instant slums' in the form of 'low-cost' housing, but wide use of FHA 235. The 'low-cost' housing is as expensive to erect as luxury housing (apartments); it induces no sense of self-respect among tenants, and ghettoizes the indigent. By making new housing available to the wage earner through FHA 235, his home, in turn, becomes available to the indigent--in many cases through FHA 235 as well. In this manner, even the indigent can own his residence, and thus have some feeling of equity in the community. He is not isolated into a welfare community. In the meantime, the wage earner is able to better his housing. 'Low-cost' housing is expensive because it is usually on high-cost land, built at union wage scale, in accordance with the superannuated city construction code. New housing, erected by the wage earner, will likely be at less actual cost to construct, and at only a fraction of the cost to the taxpayer, thus making possible a maximum number of new units in the total housing market. I am aware of the scandalous maladministration of 235, but this is the fault of contractors and administrators. (Questionnaire #04531, a leader in Health and Welfare.)

Another approach is suggested by a leader in Housing and Urban Development:

> 1. The State Housing Development Corporation should be funded, granted the right of eminent domain, and set on a course of land acquisition and housing development.
>
> 2. More federal, state and local money should be made available for subsidies or write-downs for low income family housing purchases or non-profit development of rental housing.
>
> 3. A county-city housing czar should be appointed and given sufficient power to reorganize the housing development and allocation 'system' to make it more efficient and more accountable.
>
> 4. A land use plan for the county should be suggested and aggressive action taken by county and/or city to implement development of housing within the scope of the plan.

> 5. A non-profit management corporation should be funded to manage subsidized and marginal housing. (Questionnaire #05442.)

The themes which are common to most of the leaders who discussed the need for low- and middle-income housing (and housing for the aged) are of the following kind:

(a) A county-wide approach is needed, rather than programs confined to the city of Pittsburgh only.

(b) Smaller housing units are preferable over massive projects--and such units to be scattered throughout the area rather than concentrated in any particular location(s).

(c) Emphasis needs to be placed on non-profit approaches and on various modes of cooperative effort leading to lower costs and improved housing quality.

(d) The need for supporting services must be incorporated into housing construction plans, and all ancillary services should be made available in any program of resettlement.

In suggesting steps that should be avoided, the leaders tend to underscore what they expressed in the way of recommendations for action: no concentration of low-income projects in particular locations; no construction to perpetuate patterns of segregation; no rentals without appropriate inspection by health and building inspectors; no forcing of people now housed to resettle until satisfactory alternative housing becomes truly available; no more movement of people to make room for more highways--this being the opposite of what "should be happening."

The study participants are not optimistic about progress in the coming years. "We will continue our fumbling and bumbling ways," says a leader in Health and Welfare (questionnaire #04431), a statement to which many others would subscribe. Some of the leaders even feel that precisely the wrong kinds of programs are most likely: more construction in marginal areas ("teetering on the brink of irreversible urban blight," questionnaire #05344, from a Housing and Urban Development leader), tending to be segregated, and accentuating the exodus of Whites from such areas.

Such organizations as Action Housing, RIDC and SPROL are seen as favoring a metropolitan approach to the housing problems--though Action Housing is also believed (by at least one of the leaders) opposed to the idea of scattered, rather than large-scale concentrated, sites.

The universities ought to make "any real expertise they can offer" available to city and county government as well as to citizen groups (Questionnaire #04531); they could set an example "of concern for housing of low and moderate income families by initiating innovation relocation alternatives for families affected by University expansion policies" (Questionnaire #05442); and they could convene interdisciplinary seminars to explore the most viable options. They could also help "allay fears of suburbia that low and moderate income housing does not mean that there will be a great exodus of Black families to their particular community." (Questionnaire #05745). And, of course, the universities should encourage, and carry out, research into "actual need and show social and economic feasiblity." (Questionnaire #10191.)

13. DRUGS

New approaches to the "drug problem" appear clearly needed. The leaders rated the item among the most desirable changes, an extremely important issue--and one somewhat more likely than not to make steps toward resolution over the coming five-year span.

The main ideas which emerge from recommendations of the seven leaders who chose to stress this particular item are the following:

1. Provision of federal funds, since the magnitude of the problems exceeds the capacity of any other governmental unit

> or private source, to create an independent total procedure for appropriate medical attention to users, in special facilities, then followed up by effective, continuing supervision and assistance, for life, if necessary, as is done for persons with diabetes, epilepsy, etc. (Questionnaire #00802, a leader in Judiciary.)
>
> 2. More restricted distribution of drugs--keeping after the medical community to seek internal controls over prescriptions. (Questionnaire #03522, an educational leader.)
>
> 3. Methodone should be made more available.
>
> 4. More hospital beds are needed.
>
> 5. All-out effort at all levels of government to apprehend the suppliers and adequately punish them. (Questionnaire #06354, a Black Community Programs leader.)

In turn, we should not expect "that charitable organizations will be able to achieve any significant results, other than experiments, demonstrations, suggestions, and the like" (Questionnaire #00802, mainly due to the financial limitations under which they must function A multitude of agencies "which cannot deliver the goods" should not be encouraged, nor should the "medical community" be permitted "to make the decision on approaches to controls, distribution, sales, prescription, etc." (Questionnaire #03522.)

With the latter point (coupled with emphasis on internal controls within the medical profession on drug prescriptions), the AMA, drug manufacturers and many legislators are seen in disagreement--while educators and parents of victims, as well as those who have been working closely with the addicts, are seen as supportive.

The collection, analysis and dissemination of accurate information is emphasized as the main contribution of the universities, coupled, perhaps, with research to find new "less destructive" drugs.

14. OTHER ISSUES

Only very few of the leaders, generally one or two, commented on the remaining items from among the roster of twenty-eight. Many of them chose to add items which they thought to be of particular importance, but there is no convergence of views on any one such issue.

In this section, we will briefly outline the pattern of ideas as they, by and large, scatter over a variety of concerns. We will highlight only what the leaders feel ought to be done when such information is provided with sufficient specificity.

In the labor field, several points are stressed--not altogether compatible with each other:

1. New organizing programs on the part of the unions are needed if successful appeal is to be made to the "growing ranks of hospital workers, retail and government employees.

2. The white collar worker is clearly a necessary area for organizing efforts.

3. Ratification of labor agreements should be made by secret ballot.

4. Labor agreements should have "a common expiration date where the employer bargains with more than one union." (All these points from a labor leader, questionnaire #02816.)

5. Monopolistic, discriminating practices of the 'hiring hall' need to be eliminated--with union membership open to all on basis of capability and not on a union controlled basis. (Questionnaire #02011, an industrialist.)

6. Wages must relate to productivity, cost of living, and ability to pay (since 'every new wage contract cannot automatically guarantee a substantial increase regardless of the economic health of the industry and the company negotiating the contract. . . . The powerful unions have negotiated wages, and hence prices, to a level which has left much of our society, such as pensioners and low income public and institutional employees, at a virtual poverty level. (Questionnaire #09281, a media leader.)

Long-term investment in Pittsburgh, in fact throughout the Commonwealth, is likely to suffer greatly due to the "hostile attitude of state government, Senate and House, including both political parties." (Questionnaire #02715, a leader in Banking.) Unlimited growth in every community should not be encouraged--in Pittsburgh, in particular, "every effort should be made to change the employment mix away from heavy industry and toward services suitable for the center of the tri-state region." (Questionnaire #08771, a leader in Environment Control.)

One of the leaders (Anti-Poverty Programs) feels that Pittsburgh's mass communication media handle everything in terms of "what will sell or what is entertaining," there being "not a single outlet that presents events by following the six basics: who, what, where, when, why and how." (Questionnaire #07458.) Another one suggests that the media need to make more of a concerted effort to make "people aware of the problems" to help do away with the community apathy which the leader senses. In turn, "churches, synagogues, racial and ethnic media are simply too slanted to show hope, not to mention some objectivity." (Questionnaire #07964, a leader in Religious Social Service Programs.)

On some of the implications of the Interstate Highway System (and related construction programs), one respondent has this to say:

> Pittsburgh has suffered long enough from haphazard development of its transportation system. Everything that is proposed is torn apart by opposing groups whose immediate objective may be good but whose long-range results are the denial of the kind of transportation that we need. The way we are presently developing suburban housing and insutrial development sites amde possible by the new highway system which unfortunately was not built with the added volume of traffic resulting from such building construction as one of the factors in numbers of lanes, cross-overs, accesses, etc. We continue to develop improved highways then let them end in what has always been a bottleneck and dismiss it with a shrug of the shoulder that somehow common sense will prevail and people will work their way out of the mess. (Questionnaire #04431.)

All in all, twenty-three leaders included in their responses items which were not specifically cited in the listing of "twenty-eight" issues. The following suggestions are quite representative of the tenor of the concerns:

1. We should set up a Public Works Administration to provide employment for many of the unemployed and many employable otherwise on welfare rolls. (Questionnaire #09071.)

2. More employment opportunities for the hardcore unemployed need to be developed by business and industry. (Questionnaire #01911.)

3. More Day Care Centers are needed (Questionnaire #08665).

4. Expansion of family planning activities is desirable. (Questionnaire #04531.)

5. A re-evaluation of efforts to utilize young people as manpower but also, to insure their commitment, is called for. (Questionnaire #05442.)

6. Community-police relations need improving by making the Police Department "responsible to the community through citizen's committees" (Questionnaire #08665)--also, the Police Trial Boards should be discontinued since "the dispensing of justice by police against fellow police has brought about no significant change in police attitudes and behavior toward civilians." (Questionnaire #06051.)

7. A credit union should be established in all poverty areas; a coordinator should be selected to better serve poverty areas. Such a coordinator should 'get extensive training from the National Credit Union Association and the Penna. Credit Union League.' (Questionnaire #06758.)

8. The Trees Hall type program should be expanded to all areas of the community. (Questionnaire #05954.)

9. United Family Service needs more support to provide a more comprehensive service. (Questionnaire #04635.)

10. More positive communications on the part of State, City, Business and educational leaders are needed so that people could also get into a more positive, constructive, frame of mind. (Questionnaire #03924.)

11. A state law is needed to remove the exemption of religious institutions from taxation, or at least, they should be encouraged to join a campaign for voluntary payments. (Questionnaire #00602.)

12. Much more comprehensive educational programs within the school system are needed to really tackle the crucial problems of racism. (Questionnaires #08665 as well as, in somewhat different words, several others.)

13. Slum clean-up projects are long overdue. (Questionnaire #09071.)

14. Programs to revitalize dedication to, and pride in, work are needed, a kind of "renewal-of-pride" program. (Questionnaire #04032.)

Indeed, this is not an exhaustive statement of all the concerns or of all the suggestions. But it does give an overall taste of the kinds of issues which are most salient to this particular group of individuals--106 community leaders of Pittsburgh.

IV

SOME IMPLICATIONS

1. THE NEXT FIVE YEARS

Almost 60 percent of the leaders also chose to respond to a general question regarding Pittsburgh's prospects over the five-year period of early 1970's.

The specific question was stated as follows:

> In addition to the specific issues that you have just commented on, how do you feel the Pittsburgh community will develop as a whole over the next five years? That is, what significant trends do you see emerging over this time period?

Now, in the most general sense: there are just about as many pessimists as there are optimists. Nor are these terms imputations of sentiments, since many leaders use them precisely in this manner to describe their expectations regarding Pittsburgh's overall development in the coming years.

Those who are generally pessimistic anticipate at best continued "stagnation" (a term used by the respondents), and most of them foresee "deterioration." In most instances, the negative expectations are tied to the prospects of the community's economy in that industry is expected to migrate out of the city either into suburbia or even out of the county and the commonwealth.

The second major element in the more negative anticipations has to do with migration of the city's residents--an ongoing drift especially into the suburbs with its effect on further decline in fiscal viability of the city itself.

The third key factor in the more pessimistic expectations has to do with politics in a more basic manner: the nonresponsiveness of party organizations to community needs, parochial disputes affecting any possibilities of development, slowness of decision-making even on matters of considerable urgency (such as rapid transit), and the like.

The fourth fundamental concern which yields a more pessimistic view of the future has to do with personalities as such, and more exactly, with a kind of leadership vacuum, apart from the directly political problems already mentioned. In this regard, quite a few of the leaders commented on the absence of the kind of dynamic and inspired leadership, or perhaps catalytic function (as some put it), of personalities like Richard King Mellon. The somewhat pessimistic leaders do not see such leadership in the making within the political system or in the larger community.

Although it is fairly clear that all leaders would subscribe to the notion that the state of the nation (both economically and politically) has a profound bearing on Pittsburgh's future, only two of them cite this factor explicitly as one on which the city's prospects directly depend. One of them foresees salutory national, thus Pittsburgh, development, and the other respondent anticipates continued troubles in the nation's economy with their direct impact upon Pittsburgh.

On the whole, only one community leader is altogether pessimistic: a leader in the communication medias, he expects a complete collapse of the public educational system and outbreaks of violence of considerable magnitude, not confined to the "ghetto areas" only.

There is no one who counterbalances this more extreme view on the positive side: none of the optimists predict a rosy future, and their more hopeful expectations tend to be modest in projecting what can be achieved over a five-year period.

Other than non-specific reactions (such as, "I am optimistic about Pittsburgh's future"), the optimists expect considerable improvements in Black-White relations during the period. On this front--except for the respondent who expects violence, though not confined only to the racial issue--actually only one leader anticipates some possible deterioration in Black-White relations, and this is tied to the degree to which labor unions will be willing to open up their doors to increasing membership of qualified Blacks.

The second factor which enters into the pattern of more optimistic answers has to do with expectations that programs to attract new industry and business into the community will become ever more vigorous and that they will succeed in so doing with the resulting diversification of the economic base of the community.

The third major element in the optimistic projections has to do with hopes that some form of rapid transit system development will have been at least started in the five-year period under study, and that various intermediate improvements in the transportation system will, in fact, come about, though their exact nature is not specified.

The fourth factor in the more optimistic view of the future pertains to metropolitanism: some of the leaders expect amalgamation of at least some municipalities, and many foresee greater awareness, county-wide, of the need for governmental reforms in the direction of metropolitan governance.

Fifth, some leaders feel that increased citizen participation in decision-making at the neighborhood level will produce beneficial results by counteracting the otherwise "archaic political system," and some of them place high hopes in the involvement of young people in the decision-making processes, specifically through the enfranchisement of the 18-20 year olds.

Now, there are quite a few leaders in the total group who cannot be considered either pessimistic or optimistic in terms of their reactions to the question. Rather, they view the coming five years as a kind of period of "preparation," "tooling up"--and in this regard many emphasize the importance of various essentially ideational factors. Thus they feel that greater sensitizing to the city's problems will mark the period (without necessarily saying that the solutions to such problems will be found, or whether such solutions if found, would begin to be implemented in the post-1975 period); greater awareness on the part of the citizens as a whole of the community needs will result; attempts will be made, as these respondents feel they should, to forge a sense of "unity of purpose" in the community, and the like.

In sum, the more optimistic respondents foresee modest progress, especially in Black-White relations, in transportation (rapid transit), in steps toward metropolitanism, in housing, in attempts to deal with the drug problem, in citizen participation in community affairs, in the influx of new business and industry, and the corresponding expansion of the labor market. The more pessimistic respondents, on the other hand, envisage further drift of the population away from the city; migration of industries out of the city and the area; political indecision in dealing with problems when and as needed; and reliance, in effect, on "business as usual" philosophy (as at least two of the leaders put it exactly) despite the pressing needs for action. And then: about 40 percent of the leaders are inclined toward optimism (generalized or with regard to specific, but important, issues), 40 percent lean toward more pessimistic expectations (also either in general or with regard to specific issues), and the remainder cannot be placed very well into either category, though they tend to be those leaders who view the coming five years as a period of consideration and reconsideration, growing awareness, increasing sensitivity and, in part, frustration, especially in terms of taxation. If these projections on the part of the leaders have some merit in permitting us a better glimpse of the future than we otherwise might acquire, in a more solipsistic interpretation, then the overall balance suggests that Pittsburgh of 1975 will not be very different from Pittsburgh of 1971.

Since many problems are acute, and are recognized as such, this alone would suffice not to be a cause of great rejoicing. But there is concern and there is desire and there is a sense of involvement. These, perhaps, are sufficient grounds for hope.

2. SO WHAT?

The central question now is not whether we have learned anything about the perspectives of selected Pittsburgh leaders and about the prospects for Pittsburgh, but whether what we have learned can be put to some practical use. Indeed, the study was not undertaken as an exercise in data collection, but precisely with a view toward the concrete implications of the data.

In these concluding remarks, we propose to explore some of the practical ramifications as they seem to flow directly from the data, and as they appear to be suggested, in a more indirect manner, by the results. However, it is not our task to attempt to say what should be done, in the way of policies, with respect to the various issues which face the community. Thus, we do not intend to discuss how to handle the "drug problem", or which of the possible rapid transit options is most compelling, or what steps might be taken to bring about (for those who desire it), or prevent (for those who are so inclined), the emergence of a metropolitan government.

Many suggestions, some general and some concrete, have been made by the leaders themselves and they are, at this level of analysis, summed up throughout Part III of this report. Many of these recommendations clearly merit the most serious consideration; however, we refrain from assessing their relative worth because in this phase our study was not designed to provide evidence on which we could soundly base such evaluations. In turn, our personal preferences are, and should be, of little concern to the reader and we will not yield to the temptation to state them.

First, the study provides feedback. It allows each leader from whom views were solicited to confront his own thinking about the future of this community with the ideas of other prominent members of the Pittsburgh community. This we think highly useful. In fact, it is very likely that the leaders represented in this research may have never sat together in one room, or if they have, it most likely was as an audience exposed to the ideas of a speaker or a panel. Here, all of them have been heard and the ideas of each and every one of them have contributed to the mosaic of results.

Secondly, and along similar lines, the study provides feedback about the thinking of a group of the city's prominents to other prominent members of the community and to the general public as well. This, too, seems useful as one of the inputs into any forthcoming dialogue concerning the problems which face Pittsburgh, as well as the practical approaches to these problems. Perhaps the study should serve, in some small measure, as an opening to such a dialogue not only for the sake of facilitating exchanges of opinion, but as an aid in arriving at a consensus regarding appropriate measures which need to be taken toward betterment of the quality of life in Pittsburgh and in our whole area.

We suggest that, at the most concrete level, the feedback functions of results such as these can be most beneficial were each reader to ask, and answer for himself, a number of questions:

1. Which of the perspectives do I agree and disagree with?

2. If I disagree (that is, assign high likelihood though others assign low likelihood, or vice versa; consider desirable what others think is unwanted, and vice versa; believe important what others assess as much less important, and vice versa), what assumptions have I made that might be different from the assumptions others are making to arrive at their conclusion, so different from mine? That is, what are others assuming so as to come up to estimates at variance with mine?

3. Given such differences in assumptions (which yield differences in conclusions), what information would I need to have (what would constitute evidence) to alter my views on the matter?

4. Which policy recommendations that are made by others, and at variance with my own thoughts on what needs to be done, might be worth exploring--even though I am, to begin with, disinclined to consider them meritorious?

It is altogether crucial to recognize that we are not suggesting that those who find their own views at odds with the position expressed by others and find themselves upholding a "minority" opinion should necessarily change their minds. Majorities have often been shown to be mistaken--as have minorities. Judged by the criterion of the kind of contribution that it can make toward constructive dialogue in the future, we say that the feedback effect will be best if the reader makes himself explicitly aware of what it would take if he were to change his mind, rather than, as the first step, how to change the mind of others.

Next, let us consider the implications of the study at a level more concrete than that of the general notion of feedback as being of some value. There are, at least, three key issues which deserve highlighting at this time.

First of all, there is the issue of the basic political order. Throughout the study, and with minor exceptions item by item, we detect unfavorable evaluations of politics, politicians, and, especially the major political parties, both Republicans and Democrats.

The importance of this point cannot be overemphasized: the participants in the study, after all, are not those in our midst who have become so disenchanted with the political system of the nation as to seek its complete revolutionary transformation if not destruction. The participants are among the most prominent members of the community; in fact, by far most of them are the epitome of the Establishment and all of them are, by the nature of their roles, within the Establishment.

This alone means that a great deal of reappraisal is needed on the part of the political leaders of both dominant parties as to what it would take to alter a climate in which disenchantment with politics as usual is so strong not merely among extremists but also, as in this case, among members of the Establishment elites themselves.

From what we surmise on the basis of the data, the issue is not one of a "better image" of the politician or of the party organizations. Rather, it is an issue that involves changes which would lead to greater responsiveness at the level of action so that instead of being perceived as fundamental obstacles to progress (as they, in fact, are viewed), the political structures function as its torch-bearers, or minimally, as its catalysts. Since most changes of the deliberate variety have to come about through the workings of the political process, disillusionments with its functioning which breed rebellion or apathy (when intense and prolonged enough) hit at the very core of America. Rationally considered changes have to come from within the political order itself, by actions of those who are in politics. If not, we may be taking a chance on eventual radidical transformations which the passions of the day might dictate, and which might well prove quite counterproductive no matter how well intended.

In light of the underlying theme running through the responses of the leaders--we repeat, not with regard to the views of some "extremist minority"--the days of "politics as usual" seem numbered, and if changes do not come about from within the political system itself, they will come about from without.

This is an issue particularly salient to the political parties (of Allegheny County and of the City), and we cannot but make clear that change is in the wind, and that they can either lead it (by appropriate tooling-up and retooling) or be, step by step, left aside as structures of days gone by. And finally, let us underscore: these are conclusions we derive from the data and from the deep sense of concern based on the data, and not somehow personal reifications of the author.

The second issue, fully tied to the first major one (problems having to do with the political order) is that of pessimism. Indeed, many leaders--as many as half of them, in fact--are inclined to feel that things in Pittsburgh and environs will not go well in the coming years. Every period of history finds its optimists and its pessimists. There always have been prophets of impending doom. There always have been those who hope realistically, and those who hope against hope. This then is not the problem.

Rather, the real dilemma is this: if there are about as many pessimists as there are optimists in a group of Pittsburgh community leaders, why and how should citizens be optimistic? Let us explain a bit: the leaders are precisely the people who are in positions of power and influence. They can help to make things happen.

If people who can effect changes, by virtue of a position in society in which they have power far in excess of most citizens, turn out to be pessimistic about what can be done, this does not bode well for the future. How then should, or could, other people in the community be more optimistic? If the community leaders do not feel that things can get done, how could those who do not wield enough power or influence expect to bring about desirable changes?

The major factor in the pessimism of the leaders has to do with the functioning of the political system, and the behavior of politicians, so that the issue is closely linked to the one which we chose to briefly discuss as the first issue.

Yet, the avenue toward a solution seems different from the "political structures" problem. The latter issue requires reconsideration on the part of the politicians and of the organizations in which they act. The problem of "pessimism," on the other hand, must be dealt with by the leaders and perhaps others themselves.

The leaders do have a great deal of power, to repeat both what is obvious, in that it derives from the definition of the "community leaders," and what we have asserted repeatedly. Hence, the leaders need to consider how their power and influence is to be used to reform the political system as well as how to get things done through the political system as it exists or as it may be altered, rather than giving up to a mood of pessimism which can neither reform politics nor use existing structures toward desirable ends.

The very last thing we can afford in Pittsburgh is the attitude on the part of the influentials which prompts them toward withdrawal, the shrugging of shoulders, the feeling that nothing can be accomplished anyway. About half of the participants in our study lean in this direction, and since the most precious resources, the human ones, in any community are severely limited, this is "half too many."

Our community leaders are specialized people, by and large. They are major legal figures in our area; they are major industrial leaders; they are prominent personalities in education and in religion. They are people committed to helping to move the poor out of poverty, the Blacks out of indignity and often poverty. They are leaders in our media of communication, the newspapers, radio, television.

The results suggest that they, each and every one of them, may have to go beyond the bounds of specialization. They may have to consider plunging, with uncertain consequences and probably non-existent rewards, into the total life of the community and thus extend themselves, often beyond their immediate know-how and expertise.

They are needed. If they do not respond, only very few others will or can. There is no escaping a simple fact: a position of power or influence, and usually both, demands performance well beyond one's own specialized task, because power and influence tend to spill over into other areas of life and thus must be used with zest and with imagination and with dedication.

Thus, our summary regarding this issue must be somewhat as follows: no citizen can afford to be complacent or withdrawn, but a special responsibility rests with those who find themselves in positions of power and influence. These people cannot simply say that "things are going to get worse," or are, at best "going to continue being about the same," and still expect the respect of their compatriots. Since they can influence the future, they must. Since they can be influential, they must use their influence. The "pessimistic" perspective does not allow for that, and we cannot but urge those leaders who are "pessimistic" into the whirlpool of risky debate, risky deliberation, risky action--since there is, in fact, so much that they can contribute.

This whole point, in turn, is tied to the third major issue. It has to do with the need for leadership, a factor which in one way or another permeates most of the responses.

This, too, is different from institutionally set up leadership of local or county government. There is a great deal of feeling, and it seems justified, that the community needs a coalition leadership in which those outside of government itself can help provide inspiration, motivation, sense of unity of purpose, and some of the human, physical and fiscal means toward attainment of particular goals.

To put it bluntly again: where are the Richard King Mellons of the coming period in the community's development? This, once more, is not a formulation of our making. Rather, it stems directly from the often verbatim statements of the community leaders.

But if the Mellons of the continued rebirth of Pittsburgh in the 1970's are not going to come from among the city's leaders, where can one expect them to come from? What is needed in this sense are leaders who contribute significantly to the political process in a constructive manner, without themselves being politicians in the occupational sense of the term.

The City is unlikely to become Republican, even if the changes in political organizations were to occur along the lines mentioned previously. The major elites of the City, in terms of their access to resources, are unlikely to become Democrats, even if changes in political organizations were to come about along the lines mentioned previously.

In the coming years, "independent Democrats" are going to do better than "organization Democrats," and both are going to do better at the polls than "independent Republicans" or "organization Republicans." By and large, success at the polls will be in the above order.

On the basis of pretest interviews and open-end responses to the questionnaire, there is a feeling a new alliance and a new personality or group of individuals is needed to step into the Mellon shoes, difficult, but not impossible, though this may seem. But, of course, the Richard King Mellon equivalent of the 1970's, without a doubt, will have to be different from Richard King Mellon, exercising his catalytic and inspirational function, yet recognizing that the 1970's are not the same as the past.

Still more concretely, another three findings merit special consideration in this summary.

First, there is pervasive evidence of high receptivity to change among the community leaders. In a changing world, and in one in which the need for many changes stems from dissatisfactions with given states of affairs, this cannot but be a constructive attitude.

Since such willingness to change appears manifest among the community's leaders, it would be, at least in theory, quite possible for Pittsburgh to proceed with its development and with the reforms implied therein, not merely in a crisis environment but on an orderly and systematic basis. Waiting for problems to become so acute that any action seems better than none is far too frequently a consequence of relative complacency. It would be preferable to move with due deliberation, and due speed, before issues facing the community are so pressing that they tend to mobilize more of passion than of reason.

Examples abound.

For instance, in labor-management negotiations, is it not possible to begin hard, truly hard, bargaining well ahead of contract expiration, and to arrive at a satisfactory resolution before a costly strike takes place? The issue is this: we know that a settlement has to be made anyway, in other words, that no strike will go on indefinitely. Why do we have to have strikes at all? Within labor unions, is this not thetime to consider the ways of opening up of the membership rolls to Blacks, and then to discuss the issues with the Black leaders, before another showdown becomes necessary. Within management, has not enough time and money been wasted to recognize the legitimate demands of labor, the demands--while involving higher wages also entail increased capacities for consumption--which in their total effect might be productive, even in the narrowest "profit" sense?

The fundamental point, in this respect, is the following one: why do we deal with such issues after they turn out to be "crises"?

Is it then not possible, since Pittsburgh remains largely a workingman's town, to deal with these matters ahead of time, preventively, since we know better than most other comparable cities the cost of afterthought?

But the issue is not merely one of obvious structural conflict possibilities; that is, some labor-management disagreements are "structural" in the sense of being an integral aspect of the economic system to begin with. There are other ways of looking at this preventive type of possibility.

For example, it should be possible to agree, ahead of time, on procedures by which decisions will be made, and agreed upon once they are made, on such issues as the rapid transit.

The point is not whether this or that particular system eventually will be adopted; rather, the point is that it should be entirely possible to accept specific rules by which that kind of a decision is to be made, so that once it is made, it will encounter no further obstacles in its implementation phase.

It may well turn out that some mistaken decisions could come about in this manner: thus provisions also are needed for the kind of ongoing feedback information on the basis of which, also in terms of preagreed upon rules, changes in the decision could be made.

In other words, we are discussing procedures for arriving at decisions, while the substance of decisions is clearly beyond the purview of this paper, and, indeed, of these particular researchers.

But preestablished procedures, binding on all concerned except for preestablished ways of changing one's mind, would go a long way toward making the desirable also possible, without _post hoc_ reversions to this or that legal or political gimmick. Such procedural agreements currently simply do _not_ exist, and the evidence for their absence is one of ongoing disputes _after_ decisions have been made.

Second, there is high consensus _regarding the priorities_ of generalized changes in the Pittsburgh community and its environs. We say "generalized changes" because this _was_ the deliberate nature of our items, and because we cannot speak of specific directions of change on the basis of the information we have acquired thus far.

But this, too, is encouraging. The Pittsburgh community leaders agree very well on the relative importance of what needs doing, they agree on what is desirable and how much, and they also agree on what is likely and unlikely.

This, in turn, establishes the major _channels_ through which the energies of the community might flow, without identifying the actual ways of getting the needed things done.

However, agreement on goals, even in this general manner, would seem prerequisite to minimizing unproductive conflict, and also instrumental to ways of identifying the means by which the agreed upon objectives are to be attained.

Under these conditions, attacks against personalities and their presumed integrity or attacks based on the assumption of ill will do _not_ seem well founded in evidence, and such approaches to the community problems are clearly counterproductive.

Given consensus on goals, a great deal would be achieved by avoiding personalization of issues--and the consequent attacks on specific individuals, whatever the source of the attacks and whatever the conditions--and by avoiding the far too easy premise that only those who agree with one's position are people worthy of real respect, or even, of serious consideration.

To be entirely concrete about what could be done: the major media of communication in our community could be pioneers in refusing to publicize any arguments ad hominem--any attacks on specific individuals--and only deal with arguments pertaining to the merit of various issues, and various ways of dealing with issues.

The sole exceptions, of course, in such "attacks" or "statements" ad hominem would involve those situations in which legal action is actually involved, or court involvement becomes necessary.

The point is this: we think that the media of communication, to the benefit of the whole community, could help defuse most conflicts by not allowing their portrayal in terms of personalities to begin with. We do not think that this would make newspapers, radio, or local television less interesting. We think that it would, in fact, make them be more to the point and less to the glorification or vilification of personalities which do disappear from the scene eventually.

In this regard, it would be worth considering whether Pittsburgh ought not to pioneer a whole new approach to "what makes news."

Let us now underscore one underlying assumption: this seems appropriate under conditions of fundamental agreement with objectives on the part of different groups and varying segments of the community. Were there sharp disagreements on goals themselves, the personalization of alternative goal positions, insofar as it is possible, would not seem dysfunctional. But when goals are agreed upon, and the arguments pertain to ways of getting things done, personalization has the consequence of placing respective individuals into indefensible positions, or else into positions in which they have to defend whatever viewpoint they had adhered to even in face of better evidence because their whole personality, and thus its integrity, becomes involved in the issue. Third, we find that the various groups of leaders, divided by their major function, agree more with the Government and Law group than with any other group on all the major dimensions used in this research.

The differences are not major, either numerically or in substance, but they exist and they are consistent over desirability, importance, and likelihood. This means, for one thing, that government (and law) has an opportunity to be, and remain, the hub of the kind of compromise consensus which, in effect, would be acceptable to most people or certainly to most leaders as this study directly documents.

This seems altogether fortunate: if another community group, as such, were in this particular role, it would only compound the uneasiness already felt about the political system as a whole. The findings, in part, then counteract the seriousness of the problem of the basic political order: it still maintains enough credibility to recapture, through its own functioning, the motivations of most people. It still is not so isolated from the mainstream of thinking--though the data on rejection of the political establishment suggest this--as not to be able to prevent the kind of fundamental alienation from politics which we must otherwise read into the results.

The opportunity seems good, and the challenge seems enormous. The fact remains that the governance of our city and the county--all differences within it notwithstanding--has a great deal of capacity to reintegrate the community, and perhaps the county, around common objectives and even, around common ways of tackling the problems on the nature of which there is so much agreement.

Since government still represents the common denominator in a pattern of consensus, it also follows that doing whatever it may do, it will satisfy various interests only to a limited extent: nothing in our study shows that government can do all things "right" for all groups and all interests. But if, at this time, there is a viable "compromise" on the community's agenda, the compromise can be built around the pursuits of the government somewhat more easily than around the objectives of any other group.

In view of the strong feelings about the political order as a whole, we do not think that this attitude will be maintained for long.

We do not think that short of government's willingness to take responsibility--to make decisions and be fully accountable for them--the trend toward alienation, even among leaders, can be arrested.

To couple this major point with the previous ones:

-The need for change or reform in existing political organizations (both Democratic and Republican) is obvious and it would seem desirable if it came from within the organizations rather than being eventually imposed upon them, as it will, from without (for instance, by ever-declining chances of "organization" candidates at the polls).

-There is a need to depersonalize, both in actual pronouncements but especially in public communications (via media) about such pronouncements, statements of disagreement and disapproval and to make such matters issue-oriented rather than personality-related. Unless this is done we will continue feeding the cynicism regarding the "politicians" and "politics," and through this challenge the very fundamental structure of our society.

-There is a need to establish procedures, ahead of time, by which each and every major decision is to be made and then abiding by such procedures and the resultant decisions. Otherwise we will continue to pit one individual against another, one group against another, after a decision has already been made, thereby delaying any possible, even badly needed, action.

We think that these are minimal measures called for to assure that government can continue its claim at "representativeness" and its factual centrality in the affairs of our community.

Let us, finally, identify several major types of things which we think need doing, which all can be done, and which are all, in effect, low-cost propositions.

For one, there is need for on-going flow of ideas as to how to get things done. In many ways, there exists a largely untapped reservoir of ideas in the community and outside of it. These are ideas borne out of predilections and even prejudgments. They are ideas stemming out of a lifetime of experience. And they are the often half-baked ideas of youth, sometimes brilliant and sometimes off the mark, but always enthusiastic. We need to establish a data bank of ideas, of suggestions and recommendations, no matter how "wild" they may seem at the moment. We need to have a mechanism by which these ideas can enter into the constructive channels of community life, and a way of testing them as to realizability in terms of feasibility, cost, effectiveness relative to intended results, impact.

Closely connected with this, in fact, inextricably related to this, is the notion that we need to set up mechanisms for checking on the feasibility of alternative ideas, suggestions, plans, and policies. The question of feasibility is not only whether something is doable and what the consequences of doing it might be, but also, what the human, fiscal and physical costs of not doing it might be.

We need such feasibility tests for concepts promulgated as plausible policies and thereby expenditures of energy, money and time, as well as for "just" ideas which may not have become public issues as yet.

The issue then is one of "what would it take to make this, X, possible"--and it is not a question as to how desirable it might be and to whom. For the "desirability" of public policy, once formulated, can be handled by the workings of our political order (but consider the previously voiced thoughts concerning some of the needed reforms).

We do not think that such things as "feasibility study" contracts to commercial organizations can do the job. Such contracts may continue to be necessary and, perhaps, even desirable. But the fact remains that commercial organizations will subject to feasibility analysis only those ideas which some particular clients are willing to pay for. There is room for the testing of all kinds of ideas, at least, in a preliminary manner, and while the universities are not bastions of sainthood, they are better equipped to do the task without passion and without built-in answers than are organizations which make their livelihood out of pleasing the customer.

The third major issue we would like to mention has to do with the obvious need for comparative data. This need cannot be satisfied when the social and political climate is already pressing for action because some issue will have become too pressing to allow its dispassionate review. We need a data bank, a research organization procedure, to acquire information about the ways in which various policies, and approaches to policies, have worked elsewhere in the United States as well as abroad.

When we talk about metropolitanism, or about low-cost housing, or about ways of inducing new business and industry to come to Pittsburgh, it is, to a large measure, in ignorance of systematic experiences of other communities, and thus, fundamentally, in ignorance of what might work and what might not, and why.

No systematic procedure is in existence to provide us with timely advice on costs and benefits which others, both around the nation and abroad, may have derived from trying out the things we may be speaking about as desired policies.

The fourth issue we would like to raise has to do with the need for "objectivity," or rather, lack of passionate conviction when alternatives are being evaluated.

There also seem to be plausible mechanisms which deserve, without prejudgment, some consideration. When various domestic organizations, academic or otherwise, are competing with each other for contracts and grants which bear on information affecting public policy, it would seem altogether reasonable and fitting if they were subject to scrutiny, perhaps via a hearing, to determine their respective biases, if any.

Organizations which, before undertaking the necessary study, have already formed strong opinions one way or another on the issue which they are supposed to analyze--much like potentially biased jury members--simply should not be used. Organizations with conflicts of interest pertaining to the issue in question, similarly, should not be used.

The second major option, and we think a good one, is to avail ourselves occasionally of the advice of foreign experts especially in those matters on which our own opinions will have already been formed fairly strongly due to the prevailing climate of sentiment in our country or in our community. This is not to say that "foreign experts" are necessarily more expert, but it is to say that they can enter a situation without the judgments which many of us already hold. Nor do we mean to say that their advice needs to be followed, but its presence as input into the broader policy-making process might increase our awareness of alternatives which perhaps would otherwise not even be considered.

The fifth major issue is, perhaps, this: since many changes are possible, many are desirable, many different domains of community and area life are involved, and many alternative approaches may exist, there is need for an ongoing dialogue within the community. One of the ways to conceive of such a dialogue is the setting up of citizen volunteer task forces to subject each existing and potential community problem to ongoing study and evaluation, and to keep the community informed about the task force findings and possible recommendations.

The inclusion on such task forces of academic experts from all the institutions of higher learning in the area as participants and hopefully as resource persons might be a worthwhile step toward deepening urban-universities interactions from which all stand to benefit.

One-shot meetings on various Pittsburgh problems certainly seem to be a useful idea but chiefly insofar as such "fora," "conferences" and the like might become ongoing ventures--that is, repeated discussions among the same and additional individuals of the same issues, with a view to actually coming, at successive points in time, to actual concrete conclusions.

Activities of such task forces would, indeed, profit by the kinds of data we envisage as being generated via the "data bank of ideas," "feasibility" assessments, and "comparative" data (that is, experiences and problems of other communities around the nation and, in some instances, throughout the world).

The sixth main point has to do with the possibility of experimenting with alternative methods of "conflict management," that is, methods which well may be quite promising and, at the same time, have generally not been tried.

In this regard, "conflict," endemic in social life as it is, results when different community groups and sometimes individuals begin exercising pressures in the direction of contradictory, or mutually exclusive, policies. Insofar as an issue begins to, or does, polarize parts of the community into two opposing camps--that is, two of the possibly many alternatives acquire dominance and different groups align themselves accordingly--the conflict tends to be more severe than when various options, and various viewpoints, are brought to bear on a particular problem.

In such a polarized situation--for instance, labor-management disputes, industry-citizens disputes about pollution control, University of Pittsburgh-Peoples Oakland disputes, a solution often requires arbitration by some third party, often through our legal system.

This, in turn, occurs generally only after serious human and financial costs have been directly incurred or hidden costs have resulted from delays, and the positions of the opposing parties will have hardened beyond the point of comfortable negotiation. If we are correct in interpreting the relevant aspects of the data--that agreement among leaders, in this case, is greater in general than agreement among particular "groups" of leaders then the inclusion of third, fourth, fifth . . . parties in negotiations and settlements of disputes would tend to depolarize the issue and enhance the chances of settlement often before the costs become excessive.

Concretely, this might mean something like the following: in labor-management disputes, one might try to include non-labor and non-management leaders in the bargaining process, even though the actual settlement _must_, of course, be agreed upon by labor and management.

We think that such additional voices around bargaining tables, if heard from the very outset, could identify the common interests of labor _and_ management _and_ the larger community faster, and even better, than bilateral negotiations of opposing parties.

Thus, the suggestion is one of changing _bilateral_ disagreements into _multilateral_ negotiations, thereby taking some of the edge off of the polarity with which conflict is normally characterized.

The idea of task forces on various community issues, a notion previously mentioned, has somewhat the same effect because the differentiated composition of such task forces could help identify serious areas of disagreement before they turn into actual conflicts, and try to make recommendations to resolve them before full-blown polarization sets in.

Finally, we think that the community would benefit from setting up research mechanisms for _monitoring its own process of change_. Periodically, and systematically, the questions need to be asked: Where are we now and how did we get there (from some identifiable prior period)? Where should we be going and why? How do we determine the next targets and how do we actually move toward them? Have we been moving toward previously agreed upon objectives, how well, how fast, at what costs (not only financial), with what difficulties?

In effect, this amounts to the development of a solid _data base_ on the state of affairs of the community, through objective indicators as well as by studies of opinions, attitudes and sentiments of community leaders and citizens, and _keeping such a data base up-to-date_ by repeated observations, with a view to answering questions such as those posed above.

It is crucial to recognize that such trajectories of social and economic indicators, well systematized and standardized, that would result from this monitoring process could provide valuable inputs into policy deliberations and policy making. They should in *no way* be *thought of as a kind of substitute* for the hard thinking and bargaining which goes into actual decisions and their implementation.

In many areas of community life, the necessary data is in existence although there are few instances of its *systematic* up-dating, but they are scattered in a variety of governmental, private and educational agencies. Jointly, such data, especially time series, constitute a form of collective wisdom, but in their disparate and dissociated contexts, they merely manifest piece-meal insight at best, and most frequently, information of varying degrees of obsolescence.

These then are some of the main thoughts of the "so what?" variety to which the Pittsburgh Goals Study lends itself. Perhaps, some of the suggestions might prove useful.

APPENDIX

PITTSBURGH DEVELOPMENT: A SURVEY OF OPINION

University of Pittsburgh
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

PROCEDURE

In filling out this questionnaire, you are asked to look ahead five years. We are interested in projecting developments and anticipating new emphases that may emerge, so that your using a five-year perspective is important.

Section I of the questionnaire calls for your evaluation of a sampling of concerns or issues with respect to: (1) how likely you personally feel that changes regarding each issue will take place over the next five years; (2) how desirable you consider such changes; and (3) how much importance you attached to the issue. You can respond simply by circling the number associated with an answer that best represents your opinion on each issue. For instance, a response might be marked like this:

1. The presence in Pittsburgh of a second major league baseball team.

A. Likelihood:

1. Very Likely	2. Likely	[✓ 3. Unlikely]	4. Very Unlikely	8. Don't Know

B. Desirability:

1. Very Desirable	2. Desirable	3. Undecided	[✓ 4. Undesirable]	5. Very Undesirable	8. Don't Know

C. Importance:

Of No Importance	00--01--[✓ 02]--03--04--05--06--07--08--09--10	Extreme Importance

The last few items in Section I give you an opportunity to identify concerns or issues you may wish had been included in our sampling.

Then, in Section II, you are asked to consider in more depth a few issues to which you give highest priority and to comment further on your views of the community's future.

Please begin by glancing through the list of concerns or issues on the next two pages, so that you get an overview of the matters to be dealt with. Then proceed with the items in the questionnaire itself.

1. Metropolitan government for Allegheny County.

2. Major changes in the administration of criminal justice.

3. The development of new sources of revenue for the city government.

4. Major changes in the tax climate as it pertains to business and economic development.

5. Alteration in the patterns of long-term investment in the community.

6. The growth of new businesses and industries in the community.

7. Major changes in public school programs and curricula.

8. The introduction of a "voucher" program to allow parents and children to select among private and public schools.

9. Reorganization of the Pittsburgh Board of Education.

10. The development of new programs for racial integration in the city.

11. Innovations in the economic development of the Black community.

12. Major changes in the development of political power in the Black community.

13. Innovations in the distribution and accessibility of health care services.

14. New developments regarding the payment for health care services.

15. Reorganization of public welfare agencies and programs.

16. Innovations by private organizations regarding welfare programs.

17. The development of political power among public welfare recipients.

18. Innovations in waste disposal and air and water pollution control devices.

19. The development of new laws governing air and water pollution control.

20. Innovations in the conditions of labor union pacts and agreements.

21. Major changes in the direction of labor union organizing in the metropolitan area.

22. New developments in low and middle income housing, including housing for the aged.

23. The construction of new urban redevelopment projects similar to East Liberty.

24. Major changes in the direction of community development resulting from the completion of the Interstate Highway System in and around Pittsburgh.

25. Major changes in the regulation of automobile traffic.

26. The development of a rapid transit system for Pittsburgh and surrounding communities.

27. The introduction of new approaches regarding the use of drugs.

28. Innovations in television, radio and newspaper coverage of Pittsburgh events.

29. Other (Please Specify)____

____

30. Other (Please Specify)____

____

31. Other (Please Specify)____

____

The next few pages ask for your evaluation of each of these issues and concerns in terms of: 1. How likely you feel such changes will take place over the next five years; 2. How desirable such changes would be; 3. How much importance you would attach to each issue.

Please circle the number associated with the answer that best represents your opinion on the issue.

1. Metropolitan government for Allegheny County

A. Likelihood:

1. Very Likely	2. Likely	3. Unlikely	4. Very Unlikely	8. Don't Know

10/

B. Desirability:

1. Very Desirable	2. Desirable	3. Undecided	4. Undesirable	5. Very Undesirable	8. Don't Know

11/

C. Importance:

Of No Importance | 00--01--02--03--04--05--06--07--08--09--10 | Extreme Importance 12-13/

* * *

2. Major changes in the administration of criminal justice.

A. Likelihood:

1. Very Likely	2. Likely	3. Unlikely	4. Very Unlikely	8. Don't Know

14/

B. Desirability:

1. Very Desirable	2. Desirable	3. Undecided	4. Undesirable	5. Very Undesirable	8. Don't Know

15/

C. Importance:

Of No Importance | 00--01--02--03--04--05--06--07--08--09--10 | Extreme Importance 16-17/

* * *

3. The development of new sources of revenue for the city government.

A. Likelihood:

1. Very Likely	2. Likely	3. Unlikely	4. Very Unlikely	8. Don't Know

18/

B. Desirability:

1. Very Desirable	2. Desirable	3. Undecided	4. Undesirable	5. Very Undesirable	8. Don't Know

19/

C. Importance:

Of No Importance | 00--01--02--03--04--05--06--07--08--09--10 | Extreme Importance 20-21/

* * *

4. Major changes in the tax climate as it pertains to business and economic development.

A. Likelihood:

1. Very Likely	2. Likely	3. Unlikely	4. Very Unlikely	8. Don't Know	22/

B. Desirability:

1. Very Desirable	2. Desirable	3. Undecided	4. Undesirable	5. Very Undesirable	8. Don't Know	23/

C. Importance:

Of No Importance	00--01--02--03--04--05--06--07--08--09--10	Extreme Importance	24-25/

* *

5. Alteration in the patterns of long-term investment in the community.

A. Likelihood:

1. Very Likely	2. Likely	3. Unlikely	4. Very Unlikely	8. Don't Know	26/

B. Desirability:

1. Very Desirable	2. Desirable	3. Undecided	4. Undesirable	5. Very Undesirable	8. Don't Know	27/

C. Importance:

Of No Importance	00--01--02--03--04--05--06--07--08--09--10	Extreme Importance	28-29/

* *

6. The growth of new businesses and industries in the community.

A. Likelihood:

1. Very Likely	2. Likely	3. Unlikely	4. Very Unlikely	8. Don't Know	30/

B. Desirability:

1. Very Desirable	2. Desirable	3. Undecided	4. Undesirable	5. Very Undesirable	8. Don't Know	31/

C. Importance:

Of No Importance	00--01--02--03--04--05--06--07--08--09--10	Extreme Importance	32-33/

* *

7. Major changes in public school programs and curricula.

A. Likelihood:

1. Very Likely	2. Likely	3. Unlikely	4. Very Unlikely	8. Don't Know	34/

B. Desirability:

1. Very Desirable	2. Desirable	3. Undecided	4. Undesirable	5. Very Undesirable	8. Don't Know	35/

C. Importance:

Of No Importance	00--01--02--03--04--05--06--07--08--09--10	Extreme Importance	36-37/

* *

8. The introduction of a "voucher" program to allow parents and children to select among private and public schools.

A. Likelihood:

1. Very Likely	2. Likely	3. Unlikely	4. Very Unlikely	8. Don't Know	38/

B. Desirability:

1. Very Desirable	2. Desirable	3. Undecided	4. Undesirable	5. Very Undesirable	8. Don't Know	39/

C. Importance:

Of No Importance	00--01--02--03--04--05--06--07--08--09--10	Extreme Importance	40-41/

* *

9. Reorganization of the Pittsburgh Board of Education.

A. Likelihood:

1. Very Likely	2. Likely	3. Unlikely	4. Very Unlikely	8. Don't Know	42/

B. Desirability:

1. Very Desirable	2. Desirable	3. Undecided	4. Undesirable	5. Very Undesirable	8. Don't Know	43/

C. Importance:

Of No Importance	00--01--02--03--04--05--06--07--08--09--10	Extreme Importance	44-45/

* *

10. The development of new programs for racial integration in the city.

A. Likelihood:

1. Very Likely	2. Likely	3. Unlikely	4. Very Unlikely	8. Don't Know	46/

B. Desirability:

1. Very Desirable	2. Desirable	3. Undecided	4. Undesirable	5. Very Undesirable	8. Don't Know	47/

C. Importance:

Of No Importance 00--01--02--03--04--05--06--07--08--09--10 Extreme Importance 48-49/

* *

11. Innovations in the economic development of the Black community.

A. Likelihood:

1. Very Likely	2. Likely	3. Unlikely	4. Very Unlikely	8. Don't Know	50/

B. Desirability:

1. Very Desirable	2. Desirable	3. Undecided	4. Undesirable	5. Very Undesirable	8. Don't Know	51/

C. Importance:

Of No Importance 00--01--02--03--04--05--06--07--08--09--10 Extreme Importance 52-53/

* *

12. Major changes in the development of political power in the Black community.

A. Likelihood:

1. Very Likely	2. Likely	3. Unlikely	4. Very Unlikely	8. Don't Know	54/

B. Desirability:

1. Very Desirable	2. Desirable	3. Undecided	4. Undesirable	5. Very Undesirable	8. Don't Know	55/

C. Importance:

Of No Importance 00--01--02--03--04--05--06--07--08--09--10 Extreme Importance 56-57/

* *

13. Innovations in the distribution and accessibility of health care services.

A. Likelihood:

1. Very Likely	2. Likely	3. Unlikely	4. Very Unlikely	8. Don't Know	58/

B. Desirability:

1. Very Desirable	2. Desirable	3. Undecided	4. Undesirable	5. Very Undesirable	8. Don't Know	59/

C. Importance:

Of No Importance	00--01--02--03--04--05--06--07--08--09--10	Extreme Importance	60-61/

* *

14. New developments regarding the payment for health care services.

A. Likelihood:

1. Very Likely	2. Likely	3. Unlikely	4. Very Unlikely	8. Don't Know	62/

B. Desirability:

1. Very Desirable	2. Desirable	3. Undecided	4. Undesirable	5. Very Undesirable	8. Don't Know	63/

C. Importance:

Of No Importance	00--01--02--03--04--05--06--07--08--09--10	Extreme Importance	64-65/

* *

15. Reorganization of public welfare agencies and programs.

A. Likelihood:

1. Very Likely	2. Likely	3. Unlikely	4. Very Unlikely	8. Don't Know	66/

B. Desirability:

1. Very Desirable	2. Desirable	3. Undecided	4. Undesirable	5. Very Undesirable	8. Don't Know	67/

C. Importance:

Of No Importance	00--01--02--03--04--05--06--07--08--09--10	Extreme Importance	68-69/

* *

16. Innovations by private organizations regarding welfare programs.

A. Likelihood:

1. Very Likely	2. Likely	3. Unlikely	4. Very Unlikely	8. Don't Know	70/

B. Desirability:

1. Very Desirable	2. Desirable	3. Undecided	4. Undesirable	5. Very Undesirable	8. Don't Know	71/

C. Importance:

Of No Importance	00--01--02--03--04--05--06--07--08--09--10	Extreme Importance	72-73/

* * *

17. The development of political power among public welfare recipients.

A. Likelihood:

1. Very Likely	2. Likely	3. Unlikely	4. Very Unlikely	8. Don't Know	74/

B. Desirability:

1. Very Desirable	2. Desirable	3. Undecided	4. Undesirable	5. Very Undesirable	8. Don't Know	75/

C. Importance:

Of No Importance	00--01--02--03--04--05--06--07--08--09--10	Extreme Importance	76-77/

END CARD I

* * *

BEGIN CARD II

18. Innovations in waste disposal and air and water pollution control devices.

A. Likelihood:

1. Very Likely	2. Likely	3. Unlikely	4. Very Unlikely	8. Don't Know	18/

B. Desirability:

1. Very Desirable	2. Desirable	3. Undecided	4. Undesirable	5. Very Undesirable	8. Don't Know	19/

C. Importance:

Of No Importance	00--01--02--03--04--05--06--07--08--09--10	Extreme Importance	20-21/

* * *

19. The development of new laws governing air and water pollution control.

A. Likelihood:

1. Very Likely	2. Likely	3. Unlikely	4. Very Unlikely	8. Don't Know	14/

B. Desirability:

1. Very Desirable	2. Desirable	3. Undecided	4. Undesirable	5. Very Undesirable	8. Don't Know	15/

C. Importance:

Of No Importance	00--01--02--03--04--05--06--07--08--09--10	Extreme Importance	16-17/

* *

20. Major changes in the conditions of labor union pacts and agreements.

A. Likelihood:

1. Very Likely	2. Likely	3. Unlikely	4. Very Unlikely	8. Don't Know	18/

B. Desirability:

1. Very Desirable	2. Desirable	3. Undecided	4. Undesirable	5. Very Undesirable	8. Don't Know	19/

C. Importance:

Of No Importance	00--01--02--03--04--05--06--07--08--09--10	Extreme Importance	20-21/

* *

21. Major changes in the direction of labor union organizing in the metropolitan area.

A. Likelihood:

1. Very Likely	2. Likely	3. Unlikely	4. Very Unlikely	8. Don't Know	22/

B. Desirability:

1. Very Desirable	2. Desirable	3. Undecided	4. Undesirable	5. Very Undesirable	8. Don't Know	23/

C. Importance:

Of No Importance	00--01--02--03--04--05--06--07--08--09--10	Extreme Importance	24-25/

* *

22. New developments in low and middle income housing, including housing for the aged.

A. Likelihood:

1. Very Likely	2. Likely	3. Unlikely	4. Very Unlikely	8. Don't Know	26/

B. Desirability:

1. Very Desirable	2. Desirable	3. Undecided	4. Undesirable	5. Very Undesirable	8. Don't Know	27/

C. Importance:

Of No Importance	00--01--02--03--04--05--06--07--08--09--10	Extreme Importance	28-29/

* *

23. The construction of new urban redevelopment projects similar to East Liberty.

A. Likelihood:

1. Very Likely	2. Likely	3. Unlikely	4. Very Unlikely	8. Don't Know	30/

B. Desirability:

1. Very Desirable	2. Desirable	3. Undecided	4. Undesirable	5. Very Undesirable	8. Don't Know	31/

C. Importance:

Of No Importance	00--01--02--03--04--05--06--07--08--09--10	Extreme Importance	32-33/

* *

24. Major changes in the direction of community development resulting from the completion of the Interstate Highway System in and around Pittsburgh.

A. Likelihood:

1. Very Likely	2. Likely	3. Unlikely	4. Very Unlikely	8. Don't Know	34/

B. Desirability:

1. Very Desirable	2. Desirable	3. Undecided	4. Undesirable	5. Very Undesirable	8. Don't Know	35/

C. Importance:

Of No Importance	00--01--02--03--04--05--06--07--08--09--10	Extreme Importance	36-37/

* *

25. Major changes in the regulation of automobile traffic.

A. Likelihood:

1. Very Likely	2. Likely	3. Unlikely	4. Very Unlikely	8. Don't Know	38/

B. Desirability:

1. Very Desirable	2. Desirable	3. Undecided	4. Undesirable	5. Very Undesirable	8. Don't Know	39/

C. Importance:

Of No Importance | 00--01--02--03--04--05--06--07--08--09--10 | Extreme Importance 40-41/

* *

26. The development of a rapid transit system for Pittsburgh and surrounding communities.

A. Likelihood:

1. Very Likely	2. Likely	3. Unlikely	4. Very Unlikely	8. Don't Know	42/

B. Desirability:

1. Very Desirable	2. Desirable	3. Undecided	4. Undesirable	5. Very Undesirable	8. Don't Know	43/

C. Importance:

Of No Importance | 00--01--02--03--04--05--06--07--08--09--10 | Extreme Importance 44-45/

* *

27. The introduction of new approaches regarding the use of drugs.

A. Likelihood:

1. Very Likely	2. Likely	3. Unlikely	4. Very Unlikely	8. Don't Know	46/

B. Desirability:

1. Very Desirable	2. Desirable	3. Undecided	4. Undesirable	5. Very Undesirable	8. Don't Know	47/

C. Importance:

Of No Importance | 00--01--02--03--04--05--06--07--08--09--10 | Extreme Importance 48-49/

* *

28. Innovations in television, radio and newspaper coverage of Pittsburgh events.

A. Likelihood:

1. Very Likely	2. Likely	3. Unlikely	4. Very Unlikely	8. Don't Know	50/

B. Desirability:

1. Very Desirable	2. Desirable	3. Undecided	4. Undesirable	5. Very Undesirable	8. Don't Know	51/

C. Importance:

Of No Importance	00--01--02--03--04--05--06--07--08--09--10	Extreme Importance	52-53/

* *

29. (Please Specify)____ 54-55/

____

A. Likelihood:

1. Very Likely	2. Likely	3. Unlikely	4. Very Unlikely	8. Don't Know	56/

B. Desirability:

1. Very Desirable	2. Desirable	3. Undecided	4. Undesirable	5. Very Undesirable	8. Don't Know	57/

C. Importance:

Of No Importance	00--01--02--03--04--05--06--07--08--09--10	Extreme Importance	58-59/

* *

30. (Please Specify)____ 60-61/

____

A. Likelihood:

1. Very Likely	2. Likely	3. Unlikely	4. Very Unlikely	8. Don't Know	62/

B. Desirability:

1. Very Desirable	2. Desirable	3. Undecided	4. Undesirable	5. Very Undesirable	8. Don't Know	63/

C. Importance:

Of No Importance	00--01--02--03--04--05--06--07--08--09--10	Extreme Importance	64-65/

* *

31. (Please Specify)____ 66-67/

____

A. Likelihood:

1. Very Likely	2. Likely	3. Unlikely	4. Very Unlikely	8. Don't Know	68/

B. Desirability:

1. Very Desirable	2. Desirable	3. Undecided	4. Undesirable	5. Very Undesirable	8. Don't Know	69/

C. Importance:

Of No Importance	00--01--02--03--04--05--06--07--08--09--10	Extreme Importance	70-71/

* *

END CARD II
BEGIN CARD III

SECTION II

Using the list of issues you have just considered, this second section is devoted to an examination of the three issues or areas of concern that you consider of highest priority. (Certainly, should you desire to address yourself to more than three, we would be delighted to have the benefit of these additional evaluations.) In the next few pages we are interested in the specific expectations and recommendations that you feel apply to these priority issues over the coming five years. Moreover, we would like your overall impressions of how metropolitan Pittsburgh may develop over this time period, including any significant trends you see emerging.

Since there can be some overlap among the issues, we ask that you take the name and/or number of the issue under discussion from the list in Section I and place it in the upper right hand corner of each page that follows.

First Issue: Name and/or Number____________

10-11/

1A. What do you feel should be done regarding this issue?

12-13/

1B. On the other hand, is there anything you feel should not be done?

14-15/

1C. In general, what do you think will actually happen with this issue over the next five years?

16-17/

First Issue: Name and/or Number________________

1D. What organizations or groups do you feel share your views concerning what ought to be done?

18-19/

1E. What organizations or groups do you feel might suggest a different approach from yours?

20-21/

1F. Are there any measures that you feel the universities of the city could or should undertake regarding this issue?

22-23/

Second Issue: Name and/or Number________________

24-25/

2A. What do you feel should be done regarding this issue?

26-27/

2B. Is there anything you feel should not be done?

28-29/

2C. In general, what do you think will actually happen with this issue over the next five years?

30-31/

Second Issue: Name and/or Number________________

2D. What organizations or groups do you feel share your views concerning what ought to be done?

32-33/

2E. On the other hand, what organizations or groups might suggest a different approach from yours?

34-35/

2F. Are there any measures that you feel the universities of the city could or should undertake regarding this issue?

36-37/

Third Issue: Name and/or Number__________________

38-39/

3A. What do you feel should be done regarding this issue?

40-41/

3B. On the other hand, is there anything you feel should not be done?

42-43/

3C. In general, what do you think will actually happen with this issue over the next five years?

44-45/

Third Issue: Name and/or Number_______________

3D. What organizations or groups do you feel share your views concerning what ought to be done?

46-47/

3E. What organizations or groups do you feel might suggest a different approach from yours?

48-49/

3F. Are there any measures that you feel the universities of the city could or should undertake regarding this issue?

50-51/

4A. In addition to the specific issues that you have just commented on, how do you feel the Pittsburgh community will develop as a whole over the next five years? That is, what significant trends do you see emerging over this time period?

52-53/

4B. Do you have in mind any other organizations, groups or individuals that you feel should be contacted for their views on the issues and trends you have presented here?

54-55/